PETER J.S. DUNCAN

RUSSIAN MESSIANISM

THIRD ROME, REVOLUTION, COMMUNISM AND AFTER

Also available as a printed book
see title verso for ISBN details

Russian Messianism

Russian messianism is the view that the Russian people are the chosen people. This idea has preoccupied some of the most well-known Russian writers for centuries: through suffering and adherence to Orthodox Christianity, the Russian people will redeem the errors of humanity. When the USSR collapsed in 1991, many in the West expected a new era of freedom to dawn, whereas in reality most Russians are nostalgic for the Soviet period and many blame the USA for their present problems.

This is the first book in English for half a century to analyse the complexities of Russian messianism as a whole and its interaction with communism. The book spans Russian history, from the claim of the medieval monk Filofei that Moscow was the Third Rome to Lenin's idea that Western capitalism would collapse and Russia could show the way out of crisis, right up to the present day. Peter Duncan considers the Orthodox roots of messianism and also focuses on Russia's geopolitical experience and situation to explain its endurance. This unique work will be of great interest to those engaged in politics and Russian studies, as well as to professionals dealing with Russia.

Peter J.S.Duncan is Senior Lecturer in Contemporary Russian Politics and Society at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London. He is the author of *The Soviet Union and India,* and co-author of *The Road to Post-Communism: Independent Political Movements in the Soviet Union, 1985–1991*.

Routledge Advances in European Politics

1 Russian Messianism: Third Rome, Revolution, Communism and After
Peter J.S.Duncan

2 European Integration and the Postmodern Condition *Peter van Ham*

Russian Messianism

Third Rome, revolution, Communism and after

Peter J.S.Duncan

London and New York

First published 2000
by Routledge
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

Transferred to Digital Printing 2002

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005.

"To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge's collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk."

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Duncan, Peter J.S.
Russian messianism: third Rome, revolution, communism and after/
Peter J.S.Duncan.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Russia—History—Philosophy. 2. Soviet Union—History—Philosophy.
3. Russia (Federation)—History—Philosophy. 1. Title.
DK49 .D86 2000
947'.001–dc21 99–059925

ISBN 0-203-44235-0 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 0-203-75059-4 (Adobe eReader Format)
ISBN 0-415-15205-4 (Print Edition)

To my mother, Lucy Duncan, and the memory of my father, Charles Stuart Duncan

Contents

Acknowledgements ix

List of abbreviations x

Note on transliteration and dates xiv

Introduction 1

1 The origins of Russian messianism 6

Messianism 6

Jewish messianism 7

Christian messianism 9

Messianism in the West 9

Moscow, the Third Rome 11

Church and State in Muscovy and eighteenth-century Russia 12

Holy Russia 14

National consciousness 16

2 The Slavophils and Russian messianism under Nicholas I 18

Two ideologies 18

Influences on official narodnost' *and Slavophilism: Chaadaev* 19

Pushkin and Gogol 21

Slavophilism and the Slavophils 22

Khomiakov 22

Ivan Kireevsky 24

Konstantin Aksakov 24

Pan-Slavism 25

Tolerance and repression 27

Russian messianism and the Crimean War 28

3 Pro-Tsarist forms of Russian messianism: Pan-Slavism, Dostoevsky and Solovyov 30

From Slavophilism to pan-Slavism 30

Slavophilism and pochvennichestvo 32

Pan-Slavism, 1867–78: Danilevsky 32

Dostoevsky 34

Alexander III, Nicholas II and the Jews 42

Leontev 42

Fyodorov 43

Vladimir Solovyov 44

Vekhi 46

4 Messianism and revolution: from Herzen to Stalin 48

Herzen 48

Marxist messianism 49

Marxism in Russia 51

The October Revolution and Russian messianism 52

Berdiaev's view of Russian Communism 55

Russian identity under Lenin and Stalin 56

The Russian Orthodox Church and Russian messianism under Lenin and Stalin 58

Stalinism and Russian messianism: an appraisal 60

5 De-Stalinization and the growth of Russian national consciousness: the Khrushchev era 62

Literature and Russian national consciousness: early village prose, Solzhenitsyn and Novyi mir 62

Unofficial political activity 64

The anti-religious campaign and the Russian Orthodox Church 65

6 The Brezhnev era: cultural Russian nationalism 68

Cultural Russian nationalism, 1964–70: Molodaia gvardiia *and its critics* 69

Russian nationalism in literature and art, 1970–81 75

Russian nationalism in history, 1970–81: Likhachev, the gosudarstvenniki *and* Kulikovo 77

7 The Brezhnev era: dissident Russian messianism 82

The All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Emancipation of the People (VSKhSON) 82

Dissent within the Russian Orthodox Church and Russian messianism 84

"Slovo natsii" 88

Veche 89

Solzhenitsyn and Russian messianism: Letter to the Soviet Leaders *and* From under the Rubble 96

Gennady Shimanov 100

Dimitry Dudko, the Christian Seminar and the Christian Committee 104

8 Andropov and Chernenko against Russian nationalism 110

The dissidents 110

The literary struggle 111

Ideology and the leadership 112

9 Gorbachev and the end of empire 115

The beginnings of glasnost' 116

The growth of nationality tensions 122

The final struggle 126

10 Post-Soviet Russia: the victories and defeat of Gennady Ziuganov 130

The failure of the reformers 130

The Russian idea and the opposition 133

Conclusion 141

Notes 149

Bibliography 189

Index 232

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to the staff and associates of the Institute of Soviet and East European Studies at the University of Glasgow and the School of Slavonic and East European Studies (SSEES), University College London, for discussion and comment on this work over a long period. This is based on a University of Glasgow PhD thesis supervised by Stephen White, who showed remarkable patience and consistently offered me advice and encouragement, without which I should have been unable to finish. My thanks are due to him and to Jack Miller, Jimmy White and the late Alec Nove and Rene Beermann. I have a particular debt to Martin Dewhirst for passing on to me the fruits of his encyclopaedic knowledge of Russian intellectual life and sending me much valuable material.

At SSEES Geoffrey Hosking inspired me with ideas to convert a dusty thesis into a book. Members of the SSEES Post-Soviet Press Study Group, particularly Robert Service and Jonathan Aves, kept me up-to-date with current developments. SSEES research students, including Simon Cosgrove, Maria Lenn and Tim Spence, contributed in different ways. Colleagues at SSEES were good enough to allow me study leave. I had the benefit of discussions with Peter Reddaway, Dimitry Pospielovsky, John Dunlop, Gennady Shimanov, Roy Medvedev, Zhores Medvedev, Leonid Borodin, Viktor Aksiuchits, Valery Solovei, Vadim Kozhinov and Stanislav Kuniaev and the late Anatoly Levitin-Krasnov and Mikhail Agursky. Staff of the SSEES Library, Keston Institute, the RFE/RL Research Institute, and the Institutes of Russian History and of Universal History of the Russian Academy of Sciences gave me their help. I appreciate the stimulation I received from colleagues at the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth and the Royal Institute of International Affairs. Responsibility for all errors of fact and judgement is entirely my own.

Anna Dyer, Lesley Pitman and Natasha Levina aided me in many ways. Audrey Orzechowska kindly typed part of the first draft. I am grateful for an award from the then Social Science Research Council, and for a University of Glasgow studentship. My parents, Lucy Duncan and the late Charles Duncan, gave me much material and intellectual support.

Abbreviations

Periodicals

AES	*Archives européenes de sociologie*
AHR	*American Historical Review*
APSR	*American Political Science Review*
BJPS	*British Journal of Political Science*
CalSS	*California Slavic Studies*
CASS	*Canadian-American Slavic Studies*
CCE	*Chronicle of Current Events*
CMRS	*Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*
CP	*Comparative Politics*
CRSN	*Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*
CSP	*Canadian Slavonic Papers*
CSS	*Canadian Slavic Studies*
DN	*Druzhba narodov*
DP	*Dnevnik pisatelia*
EAS	*Europe-Asia Studies*
FA	*Foreign Affairs*
GZ	*Golos Zarubezh'ia*
IJSL	*International Journal of the Sociology of Language*
Index	*Index on Censorship*
JCS	*Journal of Communist Studies*
JHI	*Journal for the History of Ideas*
JP	*Journal of Politics*
Khronika	*Khronika tekushchikh sobytii*
KP	*Komsomol'skaia pravda*

KVS	*Kommunist vooruzhennykh sil*
KZ	*Krasnaia zvezda*
LG	*Literaturnaia gazeta*
LN	*Literaturnoe nasledstvo*
LO	*Literaturnoe obozrenie*
LR	*Literaturnaia Rossiia*
MG	*Molodaia gvardiia*
MK	*Molodoi kcommunist*
MN	*Moscow News*
MS	*Materialy samizdata*
NG	*Nezavisimaia gazeta*
NiR	*Nauka i religiia*
NM	*Novyi mir*
NP	*Nationalities Papers*
NRS	*Novoe russkoe slovo*
NS	*Nash sovremennik*
NYRB	*New York Review of Books*
NZH	*Novyi zhurnal*
PC	*Problems of Communism*
PD	*Politicheskii dnevnik*
PMiS	*Problemy mira i sotsializma*
PPC	*Problems of Post-Communism*
PR	*Partisan Review*
PS	*Political Studies*
PZH	*Partiinaia zhizn'*
RCDA	*Religion in Communist Dominated Areas*
RCL	*Religion in Communist Lands*
RES	*Révue des Etudes slaves*
RFER	*Radio Free Europe Research*
RH	*Russian History*
RL	Radio Liberty Research report no.
RLCA	*Radio Liberty Current Abstracts*
RLRB	*Radio Liberty Research Bulletin*
RM	*Russkaia mysl'*
RP	*Review of Politics* (Notre Dame, Ind.)
RR	*Russian Review*
RS	Radio Svoboda. Materialy Issledovatel'skogo otdela

RSS	*Religion, State and Society*
RV	*Russkoe vozrozjidenie*
SA	*Soviet Analyst*
SCC	*Studies in Comparative Communism*
SE	*Sovetskaia etnografiia*
SEEJ	*Slavic and East European Journal*
SEER	*Slavonic and East European Review*
SGiP	*Sovetskoe gosudarstvo i pravo*
SI	*Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia*
SJA	*Soviet Jewish Affairs*
SK	*Sovetskaia kul'tura*
SlavonicR	*Slavonic Review*
SNS	Soviet Nationality Survey
Sov Ros	*Sovetskaia Rossiia*
SR	*Slavic Review*
SS	*Soviet Studies*
SSL	*Soviet Studies in Literature*
SSP	*Soviet Studies in Philosophy*
SSSR VP	*SSSR. Vnutrmnye protivorechiia*
SST	*Studies in Soviet Thought*
SSU	*Studies on the Soviet Union*
ST	*Sunday Times* (London)
SU	*Soviet Union* (USA)
THES	*Times Higher Education Supplement*
TLS	*Times Literary Supplement*
UQ	*Ukrainian Quarterly*
USSR NB	*USSR News Brief*
Vestnik	*Vestnik Russkogo Studencheskogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia* (*"Studencheskogo"* omitted after No. 111)
VF	*Voprosy filosofii*
VI	*Voprosy istorii*
VL	*Voprosy literatury*
VS	*Vol'noeshvo*
WT	*World Today*
ZhMP	*Zhurnal Moskovskoi patriarkhii*

Others

Places of publication: M.=Moscow, SPb.=St. Petersburg, P.=Petrograd, L.=Leningrad

AN SSSR	Akademiia nauk SSSR (USSR Academy of Sciences)
AS	Radio Liberty *Arkhiv samizdata*
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CP RSFSR	Communist Party of the RSFSR
CPD	Congress of People's Deputies
CPRF	Communist Party of the Russian Federation
CPSU	Communist Party of the Soviet Union
KGB	Komitet gosuadarstvennoi bezopasnosti (State Security Committee)
MECW	Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Collected Works*
MEW	Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Werke*
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
PSS	*Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*
RFE/RL	Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty
RSFSR	Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic
SDS	Radio Liberty *Sobranie dokumentov samizdata*
Sob. soch.	*Sobranie sochinenii*
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Note on transliteration and dates

I have used the Library of Congress transliteration system for the titles of periodicals, books, articles and organizations. For personal names, I have compromised between the Library of Congress system and normal British usage. Tsars are referred to by their English names, “yi” and “ii” are normally rendered as “y” (Dostoevsky); “ë” as “yo” or “o” (Solovyov, but Gorbachev, Khrushchev as the more widely used version); hard and soft signs in personal names are omitted (Leontev, Eltsin).

Dates follow the Russian calendar and its change.

Introduction

What is messianism? While this will be more fully answered in the first chapter, it can be defined here more crudely as the proposition or belief that a given group is in some way chosen for a purpose. Closely linked to this is the view that the great suffering endured by the group will lead somehow to the redemption of the group itself and possibly of all humanity.

All Russians would probably concur with the view that Russia has endured unusual suffering in the twentieth century, and few foreigners would disagree. Back in 1829 the Russian philosopher P.Ia.Chaadaev wrote despairingly that Russia had contributed nothing to the world, but existed only in order to teach it some great lesson. Perhaps one such lesson is to warn the rest of the world against states pursuing ideas at the expense of the people. Russia has been a great laboratory for social experiments. Peter the Great experimented with Westernization, but exhibited cruelty to his people in the process. The Bolsheviks experimented with the creation of a socialist society and instead built a totalitarian state. In the early 1990s, under Boris Eltsin (Yeltsin), the government experimented with "shock therapy" as a means of transition to the market economy, causing economic decline and social catastrophe.

Neither suffering nor messianism are unique to the Russians. Among the East European nations the age of empire offered fertile ground for messianic dreams. Divided among three powers, Poles thought of their country as a Christ among nations, which would rise, gain its freedom and enlighten humanity.[1] The image of "crucified Serbia", rooted in the defeat by the Turks at Kosovo Pole in 1389, both justified the ill-treatment of minorities and sustained the nation at times when it seemed that the whole world was against it.[2] Russian messianism has been a persistent phenomenon, appearing with differing strengths and different forms at various times in Russian history. It has influenced some of the leading figures of Russian literature, such as Pushkin, Gogol, Dostoevsky, Blok, Bely, as well as the art of Aleksandr Ivanov and the cinema of Tarkovsky. Sometimes it has focused on the state, as in the theory of "Moscow, the Third Rome" and in the Soviet period. At other times it has focused on the sufferings of the Russian people, in the Slavophils and Dostoevsky and in some late twentieth-century

writers. "Russian messianism" is a fluid term, but nonetheless definable and workable.

The strength and vitality of Russian messianism can be explained not only by the suffering of the people, but also by the role of Orthodox Christianity and by geopolitics. A significant boost to Russian messianism was given by the fall of Byzantium in 1453 and the emerging status of Muscovy as the only significant independent Orthodox power. From this followed "Moscow, the Third Rome". The Westernizing reforms of Patriarch Nikon, and particularly Peter, gave rise to the messianic expectations of the Old Believers and the chiliastic sects, and, in the nineteenth century under the influence of the German romantics, to Slavophilism. Liah Greenfeld has attributed the rise of what she calls nationalism (perhaps better termed national consciousness) in the eighteenth century as *ressentiment* or envy of the West.[3] In the nineteenth century Slavophilism represented a rejection of the West and a reassertion, however Utopian, of what was perceived as traditional culture. A modern parallel here is with the Iranian Revolution of 1979, when Ayatollah Khomeini was called back to return his country to Islamic values after the discrediting and overthrow of the Westernizing Shah. The Slavophils wanted to return to the harmony that they believed to have existed in the "Holy Russia" of Muscovy, with Orthodoxy being the guiding force.

The October Revolution encouraged messianic sentiment; empirically, for the Marxists, Russia was now at the forefront of world history as the site of the first workers' state. The civil war, collectivization and the purges caused upheaval, disorientation and famine, again provoking a return to more traditional forms of Russian messianism. The Russian Orthodox Church was an early victim of the Bolsheviks after 1917, because of its association with the *ancient régime*. Even under the control of the security police, however, it continued to offer a form of semi-permitted dissent through the Soviet period, and within its ranks in the 1960s neo-Slavophil concepts of Russian messianism were developed. The disintegration of the Communist system from 1989 and the attempts at forced Westernization led to widespread insecurity and local conflicts. After the collapse of the USSR, the reborn Communist Party in Russia joined with Orthodox conservatives in looking for salvation to pre-revolutionary thinkers who were also anti-revolutionary.

The Orthodox messianic influence was strengthened by Russia's geopolitical situation and experience. Living in both Europe and Asia, Russia suffered threats and invasions from both. The suffering of occupation, be it Tatar or Nazi, gave way to the exuberance of victory and the opportunity of expansion, towards East and West, which promoted a sense of mission and of universalist messianic expectations. These expectations gained further resonance because unlike Poland or Serbia, for example, Russia truly was a vast nation, even now having more territory than any other country and occupying one-eighth of the world's land surface. By the end of the Second World War the Soviet Union was a superpower along with the United States; in 1961 the USSR sent the first person

into space; and by the end of the 1960s the Soviet Union had achieved strategic nuclear parity with the United States and its leaders could proclaim that the "correlation of forces" was shifting in favour of the "socialist camp". Many, not only within Russia but also in the West as well, took these claims seriously, and the Pentagon provided graphic descriptions of the "Soviet threat". The collapse of the Union came so quickly after *glasnost'* and democratization that Russians were left bewildered as to where the great power had gone, and ready to listen to new ideas.

Analytically, Russian messianism can be given the status of a "national myth"; in the taxonomy of George Schöpflin, it is both a myth of redemption and suffering and a myth of election.[4] Paradoxically, the strength of this national myth has militated against the development of the nation. As Geoffrey Hosking has argued, Russians have been impeded in developing their sense of national consciousness because of their attachment to Empire.[5] This meant, first, the idea of the Russian Empire, closely linked with Orthodoxy, and, after 1917, the Soviet Empire and the idea of Marxism-Leninism. In contrast to the empires centred in Western Europe, neither in the Russian Empire nor in the Soviet Union did the ethnic Russians gain from being the principal building block of the state. Only in the post-Soviet Russian Federation have the Russians had a chance to free themselves from imperial claims and develop their own nation-state. While Hosking regrets this underdeveloped sense of nationhood in the Russians, Anatol Lieven celebrates it, pointing out that the lack of ethnic nationalism has helped the Russians largely to avoid involvement in the ethnic conflicts that have accompanied the break-up of the USSR and Yugoslavia.[6]

This is a study of some of the people who developed Russian messianism, of their ideas and activities. In the analysis of Russian messianism, I find it helpful to distinguish between two poles: one which emphasizes the state, and one which emphasizes the land and the people. These two poles can be politically totally opposed to each other, although both remain within the messianist framework. The state-oriented messianism is linked with the idea of Moscow's domination of other peoples (nationalist messianism), whereas the people-oriented messianism is linked with the idea of the Russian people as being a model for other nations to follow (universalist messianism). A particular focus is on the Brezhnev era, since it was then that the ideas of the greatest contemporary political relevance were formulated. With the decline in Marxist-Leninist belief in the USSR, and the perceived threats to the Russian nation from within and without, Orthodoxy and Russian messianism appeared as an alternative ideology. This might provide the force to renew the Russian people, or it might be a new ideology to hold together the Soviet State against perceived threats from Western consumerism, China and Islam. The influence grew of the *gosudarstvenniki,* the supporters of a strong state who rejected Marxist class analysis but glorified alike the Soviet State and tsarist Russia.

This is not a history of Russia, or even of a particular period, but a discussion of the phenomenon of Russian messianism in its political and historical context.

When and why did it become influential, and how important has it been? I am mainly concerned with people and movements inside Russia rather than those in the emigration. The study investigates not only the attitudes of the various thinkers towards the state but how tolerant the generally repressive structures of the tsarist and communist regimes were to their critics. There has been some very good academic work on contemporary Russian nationalism in recent years. This study is different in that it seeks specifically to describe and account for Russian messianism. I would venture that this is the first book in English dedicated to Russian messianism and extending into the Soviet period since the English translation of Nikolai Berdiaev's *The Russian Idea* appeared in 1947.

Major studies of contemporary Russian nationalism began appearing in the West in the mid-1970s. The person who has done most to bring Russian nationalism to the attention of the English-speaking reader is John B.Dunlop.[7] Before him much useful work was done by Dimitry V.Pospielovsky.[8] Dunlop and Pospielovsky are both sympathetic to Russian nationalism. Their expectation that Russian nationalism would become more important in the USSR was shared by a former Soviet journalist who had emigrated to the USA, Aleksandr L.Ianov (Yanov). Unlike Dunlop and Pospielovsky, he is appalled by Russian nationalism. In his books *Détente after Brezhnev, The New Russian Right* and *The Russian Challenge and the Year 2000* [9], he predicted the convergence of dissident Russian nationalism with official Russian nationalism in a diabolical anti-Semitic chauvinism which would be powerful enough to displace traditional Marxism-Leninism as the ideology of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). He claimed that there was a pattern in Russian history whereby Russian nationalist trends, however liberal in origin, always tended towards co-operation with the state. While I shall refer to these views in this study, my own approach is to try to explain Russian messianism rather than either to justify or to refute it.

In Chapter 1, I begin by considering the origin and nature of messianism, in a comparative perspective, with reference to Jewish and Christian messianism. The chapter describes the origins of Russian messianism, looking at "Moscow, the Third Rome", Holy Russia, the impact of Peter and the expansion of Russian power up to the time of Alexander I. The approach thereafter is mainly chronological. Chapter 2 looks at the early Slavophils and the influences on their ideas in the reign of Nicholas I. It discusses their relationship to the official ideology of the period and their difficulties under the police regime. Chapters 3 and 4 follow the theme of the dissolution of Slavophilism after the early Slavophils. Those adherents of Russian messianism who favoured the continuation of the tsarist system are considered in Chapter 3: Dostoevsky is the central figure, but pan-Slavists such as Ivan Aksakov and Danilevsky are considered, and the views of Vladimir Solovyov and Fyodorov are outlined. Chapter 4 looks at the interaction of Russian messianism and socialism. Herzen is considered as a link between Slavophilism and socialism; the relationship between the Russian Marxists and the narodniks is considered in the context of the question of to what extent Marxism itself is a messianic doctrine. The chapter

makes the tran-sition from the tsarist period to the Communist system with a discussion of messianic influences in the October Revolution and under Stalin.

The short Chapter 5 on the Khrushchev era is a curtain-raiser to the chapters 6 and 7 on the Brezhnev era. Russian nationalism and messianism among writers, literary critics and historians in the official press are considered in Chapter 6, along with discussion of the response of party ideologists. I investigate the underground development of Russian messianism in Chapter 7. This covers a Leningrad organization which aimed to carry out a military coup and impose an Orthodox leadership; the publication of samizdat literature, including, in particular, Vladimir Osipov's journal *Veche,* and also the writings of Solzhenitsyn and his circle, and dissident activity among the priests and lay people of the Russian Orthodox Church. Before Brezhnev's death, the KGB under Andropov launched a major offensive against expressions of Russian particularism, and this intolerance continued while Andropov and Chernenko held the post of General Secretary, as is shown in Chapter 8. The coming to power of Gorbachev transformed the situation; Chapter 9 examines how *glasnost'* allowed freedom to advocates of Russian messianism as well as of liberal democracy. The *gosudarstvenniki* sought to undermine Gorbachev, and encouraged the August 1991 coup. Chapter 10 discusses the consequences of the collapse of the Soviet Union and the introduction of Westernizing market reforms —in particular, the adoption by Ziuganov's communists of a programme drawing on Russian messianism.

In the historical part of the thesis, my main primary sources have been the writings of the Slavophils, Dostoevsky, Solovyov and Berdiaev. In dealing with the period from 1964 onwards, I have used samizdat materials, the official Soviet Press, *émigré* literature and the post-*glasnost'* independent media.

1
The origins of Russian messianism

This chapter will seek to define messianism and Russian messianism. It will briefly discuss other messianisms, before examining the development of the two main early Russian messianic doctrines: "Moscow, the Third Rome" and "Holy Russia".

Messianism

The word "messianism" is from "Messiah", which in turn is from the Hebrew *mashiah,* meaning "the anointed one". The characteristic feature of all movements or ideas described as forms of "messianism" is the concept of the "anointed" or "chosen" individual, people, land or group. The elasticity of the term is recognized by R.J.Zwi Werblowsky:

> The term messianism…denoting the Jewish religious concept of a person with a special mission from God, is used in a broad and at times very loose sense to refer to beliefs or theories regarding an eschatological (concerning the last times) improvement of the state of man or the world, and a final consummation of history.[1]

Hans Kohn defined messianism as:

> primarily the religious belief in the coming of a redeemer who will end the present order of things, either universally or for a single group, and institute a new order of justice and happiness.[2]

This is a good description of Jewish messianism, but the restriction of messianism to "religious" belief is too narrow for present purposes. Messianism will be understood here to embrace secular as well as religious beliefs, and will concern a "redeemer" or "Messiah" that may be an entity such as a particular nation, class or party, or an individual person.

Messianism is closely related to "millenarianism" or "chiliasm", but it is not identical with them. These terms, derived from the word for "thousand" in Latin

and Greek respectively, referred originally to the thousand-year Kingdom of God on Earth expected after the Second Coming of Christ. Yonina Talmon defines millenarian movements as "religious movements that expect imminent, total, ultimate, this-worldly collective salvation".[3] The majority of millenarian movements are messianic in that they expect that salvation will be brought about by a divine (as in Christianity) or divinely-chosen redeemer, but this is not always the case. Conversely, the expectation of a messiah does not always involve the expectation of total redemption which characterizes millenarianism. Nor should messianism or millenarianism be confused with utopianism, which might be defined as the description of ideal societies without the specification of the means (still less any "chosen" means) to attain them.

It would be wrong to expect the Russian word *messianism* to have precisely the same nuances as the English. It is worth quoting a description of *messianism* given by the Russian Christian philosopher, Vladimir S.Solovyov (1853–1900):

> Outside the theological sphere, although in connection with religious ideas, in all peoples who have played an important role in history, on the awakening of their national consciousness there has arisen the conviction of the special advantage of the given people, as the chosen bearer and perpetrator *(sovershitel')* of the historical fate of mankind.[4]

While *messianism* has the same wide range of attributes as the English word, in Russian it seems to be particularly associated with the concept of the chosen people, as Solovyov's description suggests.

Father Superior Gennady Eikalovich considers Solovyov's definition to be too wide, embracing *missionism* as well as *messianizm.*[5] It is true that these two notions are related and sometimes confused. The difference between them was explained by the Russian Orthodox existentialist philosopher, Nikolai A.Berdiaev (1874–1948), who was himself influenced by Solovyov. Berdiaev wrote, in a passage which is cited with approval in a samizdat essay,

> *Messianism* derives from Messiah, *missionism* from mission. *Messianism* is much more exacting than *missionism*. It is easy to assume that each nation has its particular mission, its calling in the world, corresponding to the uniqueness of its individuality. But the messianic consciousness claims an exclusive calling, a calling which is religious and universal in its significance, and sees in the given people the bearer of the messianic spirit. The given people are God's chosen people, and in this lies the Messiah.[6]

Jewish messianism

Judaism told the Jewish people that they were the "chosen" people, and that the Messiah would be born among them. The understanding of the functions of the chosen people and the Messiah changed as time passed. The development of

Jewish messianism brought out the tension between universalist messianism and nationalist messianism which has been common to later messianisms. The universalist interpretation of Jewish messianism was that Israel was divinely chosen to enlighten the Gentiles about the one true God and carry His salvation to the end of the earth. The nationalist interpretation, on the other hand, focused on a national warrior hero. This Messiah would fulfil God's promise to His people and gather them together, reinstate them in Palestine in prosperity and destroy the enemies of Israel. These two interpretations have coexisted throughout Jewish history, although with differing degrees of emphasis on each.

For the ancient prophets of the Old Testament, such as Hosea, Amos and Isaiah, the Messiah was a national, political figure of this world, within history, who would restore the national independence of Israel, re-establish the House of David and rule as King of Israel. The country would be glorious and there would be everlasting peace. Sometimes there appears the idea of the other nations coming under Israel's political influence.[7] The universalist dimension appears, for example, in Isaiah ii, 2–4, written *c.* 740–700 BC. Here it is prophesied that "in the last days…all nations" will turn to the God of Israel who will judge them and inaugurate peace: "out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem."

Later in the development of Judaism, messianism became more nationalistic. The Book of Daniel (*c.* 165 BC) has been described by Norman Cohn as nationalist propaganda for the lower strata of Jewish society, intended to counter the attempts of their foreign rulers to destroy the Jewish religion. In Daniel's dream (ch. vii), God rewards His people for their loyalty.

> And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.[8]

Cohn calls this vision of the everlasting dominion of Israel over all peoples "collective megalomania".[9]

Jewish messianism is essentially linked with catastrophe. The sufferings of the Jews promoted the messianic ideology and, later, the occurrence of particularly cruel persecution was seen as heralding redemption. This was the case from 63 BC to 72 AD, when the increasing repression under the Roman occupation promoted expectations of the imminent coming of the Messiah and the appearance of numerous false messiahs. Judaism refused to accept Jesus Christ as the Messiah, since He was not the national, political hero who was expected. Christ's reported interpretation of the messianic prophesies of the Old Testament to refer to inward spiritual salvation, rather than to the historical world, was not regarded as legitimate.

Christian messianism

The Christianity of Jesus was pure messianism. The Greek *christos* (the anointed one) was a translation of the Hebrew *mashiah,* and the Gospels traced Jesus' ancestry back to David, apparently trying to legitimate His messianic status. As early as the first century AD the word *christos* was adopted by Christians to remove the national political connotations of the Jewish Messiah, and to spiritualize and universalize the concept of salvation. The "chosen people" were now considered to be not the Jews but the followers of Christ, Jew or Gentile. The Book of Revelations, also known as the Apocalypse (*c*. 93 AD) prophesies the events of the "last days", the struggles between the forces of light and the forces of darkness, and the Resurrection of the Dead. It is an expression of Jewish apocalyptic thought, combining Judaist and Christian elements. Revelations xix and xx contain the Jewish visions of a messianic figure with a sharp sword, and of a messianic kingdom lasting a thousand years. The Messiah is not a Jewish national hero, however, but an altruistic warrior, exalting the poor and smiting the rich, and rewarding the just of all nations. This is in the more universalistic spirit of the Old Testament prophets of early Judaism, rather than the nationalism of Daniel.[10]

Just as the Jews still waited for their Messiah, so Christ's Apostles looked forward to their Master's Second Coming, when Christ would rule the earth and fulfil the promises of the sermon on the mount. He had promised to return within the lifetime of some of those living then.[11] The sufferings of the Christians under the Roman persecution strengthened their belief that the Second Coming was imminent, just as Jewish messianic expectations were strengthened by catastrophe. But Christ failed to return and the churches moved towards an accommodation with the earthly powers. In the Eastern Church, millenarianism, with its promise of imminent salvation for the poor and punishment for the powerful, was discredited by the middle of the second century. The Book of Revelations was removed from scriptural canon. Millenarianism was the accepted orthodoxy in the Western Church for much longer, but after Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire in the fourth century, Church doctrine was modified to sanction the political rulers. Millenarianism was denounced as a Jewish heresy at the Council of Ephesus in 431. The belief in the imminent messianic age, with the struggle of Christ and Antichrist predicted in the Apocalypse, was confined to millenarian sects. These were composed mainly of the poor, and they fought Church and State.[12]

Messianism in the West

A series of revolutionary messianic and millenarian movements, based on Christianity, affected parts of north-western Europe from the end of the eleventh century to the middle of the sixteenth. People who lacked a secure place in the rapidly-changing society turned towards individuals and movements which

promised to lead them to a new society, often based on common ownership. The enemy was sometimes the Saracens, and usually the rich and the Jews. Unusual suffering again strengthened messianic expectations.

Later, the victories of the English, American and French revolutions led to the spread of universalist messianism, which frequently became nationalistic and was used to justify expansionism by military means. In 1648 a Member of Parliament named Hugh Peter expressed his belief that England was God's "elect nation", destined to use her military power to root out monarchism throughout Europe.[13] These sentiments were reinforced in the nineteenth century, after Britain had acquired an empire. Rudyard Kipling wrote "The White Man's Burden" (1898) and Cecil Rhodes proclaimed his country to be the "chosen instrument" to bring societies based on "peace, liberty and justice" into existence around the world.[14] In the nineteenth century, many Americans became convinced of the "Manifest Destiny" of the United States to carry the torch of liberty throughout the world. It is impossible to divorce these ideologies of nationalist messianism from the nationalist movements that appeared in Europe after the French Revolution of 1789. Students of nationalism have long associated it with industrialization and urbanization. A prominent nineteenth-century advocate of the view that revolutionary France was "chosen to lead and enlighten the world" was Jules Michelet.[15] Giuseppe Mazzini saw the Messiah in the Italian people.[16]

In the nationalist and messianist movements of the Slav peoples, German ideas were influential. Johann G.Herder, a German romantic, proclaimed in 1784 that the Slavs were to be the leaders of Europe. This was because of their rural occupation, their unspoilt backwardness, their peace-loving disposition and lack of ambition to rule, which at that time meant that many of them were living under a foreign yoke. He looked forward to their future emancipation. Another German, Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) claimed that God had given each people a particular mission. These ideas were taken up by the Russian Slavophils, but before them by thinkers from those Slav peoples that were more culturally oriented to the West. When Tsar Nicholas I crushed the 1831 Polish rising, the Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz depicted Poland as the "Christ of the nations"[17]:

> And they martyred the Polish people and laid it in the grave, and its soul descended into darkness.
>
> But on the third day the soul shall return to the body and the nation shall rise from the dead and free all the peoples of Europe from slavery.[18]

In conclusion, it seems true to say that almost every national group in nineteenth-century Europe, as well as the Americans, found their "prophets" who informed the group that it had been chosen for a particular mission.[19] It is worth remembering this before beginning the discussion of Russian messianism.

Moscow, the Third Rome

In the second half of the fifteenth century and the early sixteenth century, the idea developed that Moscow had a unique religious and political mission as the successor to Rome and Byzantium. The earliest surviving formulation of this idea is probably that in a letter by the monk Filofei (Philotheus), the elder *(starets)* of Eleazarov monastery in Pskov, written in 1511. Filofei addressed his Tsar, Vasily III, with these words:

> The Church of old Rome fell because of the impiety of the Apollinarian heresy; the Church of the Second Rome, Constantinople, was smitten under the battle-axes of the Agarenes; but this present Church of the Third, New Rome, of Thy sovereign empire: the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church… shines in the whole universe more resplendent than the sun. And let it be known to Thy Lordship, O pious Czar, that all the empires of the Orthodox Christian Faith have converged into Thine one empire. Thou art the sole Emperor of all the Christians in the whole universe… For two Romes have fallen, and the Third stands, and a fourth shall never be, for Thy Christian Empire shall never devolve upon others.[20]

The supposedly unique merits of the Church of Moscow are used here to justify the claim of the Muscovite ruler to lead a universal Christian Empire. Moscow is the chosen city, and its prince is the chosen Emperor.

I shall outline how the "Third Rome" idea was rooted in Muscovite culture and how it emerged under the impact of the events of the fifteenth century. The link made in Muscovy between a state and a supposedly universal church had a direct antecedent in Byzantium. As the Byzantine Empire declined, the Eastern Church increasingly took on the aspects of a Greek national church rather than a universal church. At the same time, Byzantine messianism presented Constantinople as both the "New Rome" and the "New Jerusalem".[21] Muscovy could also look back to old-Russian elements in its heritage: Metropolitan Ilarion of Kiev, in a sermon of 1049 entitled "On Law and Grace", spoke of a great temple within the "city of glory, Kiev", evoking the image of the Holy City, Jerusalem.[22] Sixteenth-century Moscow appropriated this. The Soviet scholars lu.M.Lotman and B.A.Uspensky commented: "It is characteristic that the idea of Moscow, the Third Rome, could quite soon be transformed into the idea of Moscow, the New Jerusalem, which did not contradict the first idea but could be taken as its concretization."[23]

While Rus' was breaking up into feuding principalities, from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries, the Orthodox Church became the symbol of national unity. Then, in the period of Mongol occupation, the Church was a rallying point for national feeling. The transfer of the seat of the Russian Metropolitan from Vladimir to Moscow in 1326 was vital to Moscow's assumption of national leadership.

From the late fourteenth century, the monasteries developed the ideological claim that Muscovy and her Grand Dukes were chosen to represent the climax of Christian history. The belief was reinforced by the fall of other Orthodox states to the advance of the Muslim Turks, and the success of the Muscovite rulers in drawing other Russian cities around themselves in battle against the Mongols. The Russian monks began to see Moscow as holier than Byzantium herself. In 1439, at the Council of Florence, the Byzantine Church accepted union with the Roman Catholic Church, ending (temporarily) the Schism which had divided the churches of West and East. Hostile to the Latins and feeling threatened by Catholic neighbours, the Muscovite Grand Duke Vasily II repudiated the union. He ousted Metropolitan Isidore, the Russian representative at Florence, who was Greek by birth, in 1441. A Church Council in 1448 replaced Isidore with a native Russian, without the approval of the Constantinople Patriarch, and proclaimed the autonomy of the Russian Church. The fall of Constantinople to the Turks in 1453 was later considered by the Russian ideologists to be a punishment from God for the treachery at Florence, and justification for Muscovy's stance.[24]

The way was now clear for Muscovy to claim the mantle of Byzantium. She was the only Orthodox country apart from Georgia not under Muslim rule. By 1461 the Russian Church was describing Vasily II as "the man Chosen by God…only supporter of the true Orthodoxy…Tsar of all Rus".[25] In 1470 his son, Grand Duke Ivan III, declared the Russian Church independent of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Ivan's marriage in 1472 to Sophia Paleologina, the niece of the last Byzantine Emperor, provided the occasion for the Grand Duke to adopt the titles of Tsar (probably derived from Caesar, but previously applied in Russia to the Tatar khans) and *samoderzhets,* equivalent to the Byzantine *autokrator*. In 1480 Ivan ended the last vestiges of the Islamic Mongol tutelage, and adopted the Byzantine eagle as an emblem. Millennial expectations abounded: the Church predicted that the world would end in 1492, and similar apocalyptic premonitions came in 1500. When the world failed to end in 1492, the Metropolitan of Moscow marked the event by proclaiming Ivan III to be the "new Emperor Constantine of the new Constantinople—Moscow". Another prophecy of the time, which recurred frequently in Russian messianist thought, was that the Third Rome would liberate the Second: Moscow would capture Constantinople.[26]

Church and State in Muscovy and eighteenth-century Russia

Filofei's letter to Vasily III, then, represented the culmination of a long chain of ideas. Makary, Metropolitan of Muscovy 1542–63 under Ivan IV, collected Russian religious texts and published them (on the first printing press in Russia) in two huge volumes. These included Filofei's epistle, and established an ideology linking Church and dynasty with the evocation of a Christian Empire.[27] The theory of the Third Rome was intended to justify the autocratic position of

the Muscovite rulers by portraying them as representatives of God on earth, going rather beyond the Western concept of the "Divine Right of Kings". Further, it gave them a messianic duty to expand the jurisdiction of the Orthodox State, to free their co-religionists living under infidel powers and to reconquer Constantinople for Christendom. This did not mean that the actions of the tsars were dictated solely, or even mainly, by religious motives. On the contrary, from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries the Russian Orthodox Church was gradually reduced to being a department of the State.

The raising of the Metropolitan of Muscovy to the status of Patriarch in 1589 removed the last token of Muscovy's subordination to Constantinople. Coinciding with a time of relatively weak tsarist leadership, this inaugurated a brief period of ecclesiastical supremacy. In the "Time of Troubles" (1604–13), when the Catholic Poles held sway in Muscovy, the Orthodox Church led the Russian resistance, centred on the St Sergei Monastery of the Holy Trinity, fifty miles from Moscow at Sergiev Posad (in Soviet times, Zagorsk). After the expulsion of the Poles, the *Zemskii Sobor* (Assembly of the Land) chose Michael Romanov to be Tsar. Real power, however, was in the hands of the Tsar's father, Patriarch Filaret, who received from his son the title of "Great Sovereign". Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich (1645–76) bestowed the same title on Patriarch Nikon. The latter had accepted the Patriarchate on condition that the Tsar and the nobles would obey him. With the Tsar away fighting, Nikon was able to establish something approaching a theocracy. He introduced a number of changes in the long-established Russian practices of religious ritual, with the aim of bringing them into line with practice in Ukraine and the Balkans, where the Christian Empire might extend its influence. But the Tsar, with the support of the nobles, thwarted the Church's political ambitions. The Church Council of 1666–7 gave approval to Nikon's changes in worship but dismissed him from the Patriarchate. The Council declared: "the tsar has power to rule the patriarch and all other priests". This marked the end of the attempts to create a theocracy and represented the subordination of the Church to the State. The Council also rejected the view that the fall of Byzantium was a punishment for the treachery at Florence, thereby implicitly renouncing the "Third Rome" theory.[28]

Nikon's changes provoked within the Russian Orthodox Church much opposition, led by Archpriest Avvakum. The defenders of the traditional Russian methods believed that Nikon was Antichrist and expected apocalyptic events. The Church Council of 1666–7 excommunicated the traditionalists, finalizing the Great Schism that split the Old Believers *(starovery, raskol'niki)* from the State Church. The State and Church launched repressive attacks on the Schismatics, who came to see the year 1666 as the beginning of the rule of Antichrist. They continued to believe that Moscow was the "Third Rome", and unlike the Orthodox Church they canonized Filofei.

The reign of Peter I, "the Great" (1696–1725), brought a decisive change in relations between Church and State. Since most of those within the Church who had opposed the extension of State control were in the ranks of the expelled Old

Believers, it was easier for Peter to carry even further the subordination of the Church to the State. Breaking completely with Byzantine tradition, he abolished the position of Moscow Patriarch in 1700. He replaced it with a Holy Synod, responsible directly to himself. This followed the Lutheran model and was in line with his policy of modernizing Russia through the selective imitation of Western methods. This policy was a direct denial of Russian messianism. The idea of "Moscow, the Third Rome" received another devastating shock in Peter's construction of the new capital, St Petersburg, symbolizing the abandonment of the Moscow traditions. Peter also showed his rejection of Orthodox messianism by rejecting the title of "Christian Emperor of the East", proposed for him by the Senate in 1721.[29] The imperial aspects of the "Third Rome", however, were attractive to the tsars of the eighteenth century. The expansion of Russian power and the quest for empire invited comparison with ancient Rome, and Peter adopted the Latin title "Imperator".[30]

Even at the height of the official acceptance of "Moscow, the Third Rome", it seems that no religious motivation in foreign policy ever prevailed over the political interests of the Muscovite State. The ideology may well have been significant internally, as a justification for a strong centralized State.[31] The Church constantly encouraged the expansion of Muscovy, from the time when the Metropolitan moved there and desired to bring his jurisdiction of Rus' into a single state. Religious messianism justified Ivan Ill's annexation of the north-eastern provinces. In foreign policy, the "Third Rome" theory exerted considerable influence as a rationalization, injecting a sense of religious mission into the expansion against the Catholic Poles and Lithuanians in the West and the Muslims in the East.[32] Ivan III used the treatment of Orthodox subjects in Lithuania as an excuse to launch a war against that country (1500–3), for which the real reason was his desire to expand his territory.[33] Emanuel Sarkisyanz suggests that religious enthusiasm may have had a decisive influence on expansion as late as 1552, when Ivan IV conquered Kazan. But he concurs that Muscovite expansion thenceforth was pragmatically motivated, and suggests that the "Third Rome" had even less influence on Russian imperialism than the "Holy Roman Empire" concept had on German imperialism.[34]

Holy Russia

It has been suggested above that the doctrine of "Moscow, the Third Rome" was not taken very seriously by the Muscovite tsars as a guide to policy formulation, and the concept was significantly modified or abandoned with the move to Petersburg. But the masses of the population sometimes behaved as if they took aspects of the doctrine very seriously. The peasant version of Russian messianism emphasized the holiness and uniqueness of the Russian land and people rather than the holiness of the Tsar. It should be admitted at once that there is difficulty in ascertaining what exactly the beliefs of the peasants were at any time in Russian history, since they were largely illiterate and their masters when writing

about them may well have distorted their position.[35] Nevertheless, the demands of the various peasant revolts make it possible to fit together a plausible peasant ideology, based on the myths of "Holy Russia" and the "saintly ruler".

The first known use of the term "Holy Russian" *(sviatorusskii)* in political literature occurs in the works of Prince Andrei M.Kurbsky in the sixteenth century.[36] This is in the context of his attacks on Ivan IV for allegedly betraying the divine mission of Russia and the trust put in him by God. "Wherefore, O tsar", Kurbsky wrote to Ivan "have you destroyed the strong in Israel [i.e. Russia] and subjected to various forms of death the *voevodas* [military commanders] given to you by God?"[37] The Tsar is portrayed as the antithesis of Holy Russia, dishonouring the "Holy Russian lands".[38]

The penetration of Russian messianism among the simple people is illustrated by a folk story. Christ is alleged to have denied that He was Jewish and to have asserted: "I am pure Russian".[39] For official Muscovy, the focus of holiness was the Tsar, and the uniqueness of Russia as in the "Third Rome" theory depended on the uniqueness of the Tsar. For the peasantry, Holy Russia was the Orthodox Russian people and land, whose holiness was independent of the existence of the Tsar and the Muscovite State. Peasant rebellions from the seventeenth century onwards were essentially conservative, not only in that they sought the return of the "true Tsar" or the implementation of his wishes, but also in that they sought a return to the "true Russian path" which was being abandoned by Westernizing tsars.[40]

The reign of Peter I provided a boost to the strength of the Old Believers. Peter's enthusiastic adoption of Western methods and his promotion of foreigners (particularly Germans) into high places alienated many Russians. Again the Tsar was seen as Antichrist. Merchants who had lost their privileges through Peter's reforms found that the ideology of the Old Believers was supportive of their interests; many of them broke from the Westernized urban environment and joined the Old Believer communities, spearheading the conquest of Siberia. Old Believer life was industrious and ascetic. Messianic groups with their own prophets constantly emerged and split off, keeping alive the intense religious tradition. They intermingled with the many Protestant sectarian communities which appeared in Russia from the seventeenth century onwards, and were influenced by them. Both the Old Believers and the sectarians expected the imminent end of the natural order, but while the former expected only the Last Judgement, the latter generally expected the millennial Kingdom of God on Earth. Sects such as the *khlysty* (flagellants), who called themselves "God's People", the *molokane* (milk drinkers) and, more eccentrically, the *skoptsy* (castrated ones) showed great vitality, producing numbers of "Christs" and "angels".[41]

The religious Schism symbolized the split between the State and those who sought alternatives. Berdiaev said that the Russians were Schismatics; he included the religious Schismatics, the Cossacks and the nineteenth-century intelligentsia as groups who, in different ways, tried to escape tsarist

oppression.[42] Robert C.Tucker sees the division perhaps even more starkly: the State, at any rate from the time of Peter's reforms, stood against the nation. The *vlast',* the *gosudarstvo*—the central autocratic state power—stood against *obshchestvo,* the society, and *narod,* the people or nation.[43]

National consciousness

The discussion of the State as standing against the nation and the discussion of the popular belief in "Holy Russia" presuppose the existence of some form of national consciousness. A common Russian consciousness dated back to the eleventh century and persisted while Russian land was occupied by the Lithuanians, Poles and Mongols. S.O.Yakobson suggests that it was the presence of Polish troops in Muscovy in 1610 which made "the national idea…the common possession of the vast masses of the populace" of Russia. The reforms of Nikon and then Peter provoked an upsurge of national feeling, which Yakobson calls "nationalism", in defence of the old traditions.[44] Hans Rogger prefers to call this feeling "national consciousness" when applied to the eighteenth century or earlier. He refers particularly to the attempt by educated Russians to develop a distinct Russian identity, character and culture, in reaction to Peter's Westernization. National consciousness, paradoxically, was the product of the most Westernized stratum of society.[45] Charles Ruud emphasizes the "general sense of lagging behind the West" as the "principal stimulus" to "nationalism in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries".[46] It should be added that the bearers of national consciousness and nationalism were divided about the extent to which they wanted Russia to catch up with the West or maintain her own identity.

Catherine II (1762–96) tried to use the developing national consciousness for the benefit of the State. Presenting the government as serving national aspirations, she emphasized native Russian virtues and sponsored the development of Russian culture. An enthusiast for the Enlightenment, her expansion of the Empire into Poland and the Crimea had nothing to do with any messianism. The French Revolution, however, dismayed her and she reacted with internal repression.

The reign of Alexander I (1801–25) similarly began with reform but developed into reaction. A major intellectual influence in this period was Nikolai M. Karamzin (1766–1826). In his *Memorandum on Ancient and Modern Russia,* offered to Alexander in 1811, he opposed any constitutional reforms and advocated the maintenance of national traditions, including autocracy.[47] In his criticisms of Peter I for disrupting national traditions, he proved to be a precursor of the Slavophils, although his attitude to tradition was pragmatic rather than ideological.

> In the reigns of Michael and of his son, our ancestors, while assimilating many advantages which were to be found in foreign customs, never lost the

> conviction that an Orthodox Russian was the most perfect citizen and *Holy Rus'* the foremost state in the world. Let this be called a delusion. Yet how much it did to strengthen patriotism and the moral fibre of the country![48]

As Alexander's official historian, Karamzin produced a twelve-volume "History of the Russian State", the publication of which began in 1818 and was completed only after his death. This history was republished many times and the early Slavophils were familiar with it.[49]

A tremendous boost was given to Russian national feeling by the defeat of Napoleon and the subsequent entry of Russian troops into Paris in 1814. The following year Alexander persuaded the Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia to join him in the "Holy Alliance". He believed he had a holy mission from God to defend Europe from liberals and revolutionaries, whom he considered anti-Christian. The defence of "legitimacy" governed Alexander's foreign policy, and Pierre Kovalevsky is among those who argue that it was pursued at the expense of Russia's national interests. Alexander's anti-revolutionary messianism allowed the idea that Russia had a mission in Europe to appear among the educated classes.[50]

2
The Slavophils and Russian Messianism under Nicholas I

It was in the reign of Nicholas I (1825–1855) that the Slavophils formulated their ideas. While the extent to which each of them embraced Russian messianism differed, they shared a belief in Russia's uniqueness. This chapter will investigate their ideas, the influences on them and the political consequences of their views. It will consider their relationship to other Russian messianists, and to the State and tsarist ideologists.

Two ideologies

In what follows, I use the terms "Slavophil" and "Slavophilism" to refer to the "classical" or "early" Slavophils: Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov (1804–60), the brothers Ivan Vasilevich and Pyotr Vasilevich Kireevsky (1806–56 and 1808–56), the brothers Konstantin Sergeevich and Ivan Sergeevich Aksakov (1817–60 and 1823–86), Iury Fyodorovich Samarin (1819–76) and Aleksandr Ivanovich Koshelyov (1806–83).

On the surface, there are several similarities between the ideology of Nicholas I and Slavophilism. Nicholas's reign had begun with the Decembrist revolt; he feared revolution and the Westernizing ideas which were popular among independent public opinion. His ideology has been referred to since the late nineteenth century (following Aleksandr N.Pypin) as official *(ofitsial'naia) narodnost',* usually rendered in English as "Official Nationality", although the meaning of *narodnost'* is better conveyed by "closeness to the people". The ideology was expressed in 1833 by Nicholas's Minister of People's Enlightenment, Sergei S.Uvarov: "Our common obligation consists in this, that the education of the people be conducted, according to the Supreme intention of our August Monarch, in the joint spirit of Orthodoxy, autocracy and nationality."[1]

The three elements of Uvarov's triad—Orthodoxy, autocracy and *narodnost'*—were all believed in by the Slavophils, although their interpretation of these concepts usually differed from the official view. Both the official ideology and Slavophilism were hostile to the Western ideas of liberalism and socialism, and they both postulated that Russia was in a certain sense different from the West. The Slavophils nevertheless fundamentally opposed the path of

development pursued by Russian officialdom. While there were differences among the Slavophils, they generally rejected the Westernizing reforms of Peter I, which the official ideology embraced, the lifestyle of the elite; and they sometimes idealized the Muscovite past. In this there was a continuity going back to the concept of "Moscow, the Third Rome" and the ideas of the *Raskol'niki*. Furthermore, the Slavophils idolized the Russian people, especially the peasants, rather than the State, and protested at the lack of freedom in Nicholas's Russia.

Nicholas Riasanovsky has divided the proponents of official *narodnost'* into the "dynastic" and "nationalist" wings. The dynastic wing, including the Tsar and most of his government, was strongest in St Petersburg. The nationalist wing was headed by Mikhail Petrovich Pogodin (1800–75) and Stepan Petrovich Shevyryov (1806–74), respectively professors of history and literature at the University of Moscow. Pogodin was the publisher and first editor of the journal *Moskvitianin* (*The Muscovite,* Moscow, 1841–1856), which was patronized by Uvarov. Many of its contributors, together with the poet Fyodor Ivanovich Tiutchev (1803–75), belonged to the nationalist wing. The nationalists gained much wider support than the dynastic wing among young educated Russians, and they were strongest in Moscow. The emphasis of the nationalist wing on the world mission of the Russian people brought them closer to the Slavophils and, lacking a journal of their own, the Slavophils contributed to *Moskvitianin*.[2]

Influences on official *narodnost'* and Slavophilism: Chaadaev

Similarities between official *narodnost'* and Slavophilism are partly attributable to the fact that they were both influenced by similar sources, especially German romanticism and Karamzin's treatment of Russian history. Further, Pogodin directly affected the Slavophils through his lectures; Samarin described Pogodin as the professor who influenced him most. Pogodin's views on the essential differences between Russia and the West were published in his *Moskovskii vestoiik (Moscow Herald)* in 1827, well before the emergence of Slavophilism. The impact of European idealism, especially Schelling and German romanticism, on Pogodin and on the Slavophils was very important.[3]

An experience common to some of the young men who later became proponents of official *narodnost'* and Slavophilism was association with the Moscow secret society The Lovers of Wisdom' (*Liubomudry,* 1823–25 or 1826). This was formed to spread German idealistic philosophy (especially Schelling's thought) in Russia. Nevertheless its members were critical of the Russian tendency to imitate Western ideas and advocated, among other things, a genuinely national literature. The society included the Kireevsky brothers, Koshelyov, Pogodin and Shevyryov. A leading role was played by Prince Vladimir F.Odoevsky (1803–69). In his "Russian Nights", begun in the 1820s, Odoevsky expressed his admiration for European culture, but rejected the self-

interest of capitalist society.[4] He emphasized what he called Russia's *samobytnost',* her uniqueness or originality. Russia's national mission was to lead the West back to a state of love and unity. "There will come a conquest of Europe by Russia, but only a spiritual one, because the chaos of European learning can be brought into harmony only by the Russian mind."[5]

A final influence on Slavophilism, who cannot be neglected, is Pyotr lakovlevich Chaadaev (1793–1856). Walicki considers Slavophilism to be in a sense a "reply to Chaadaev".[6] Chaadaev's "Philosophical Letters", written in 1829, expressed his deep unhappiness with the past and present state of Russia, and his admiration for the papacy, which symbolized the past and (for him) forthcoming unity of Christendom.[7] He referred to the "disastrous condition which encroaches upon all hearts and minds in our country"[8] and exhorted his reader to follow the customs of the Church. The Schism in Christianity had prevented Russia from participating in the cultural and intellectual movements of Western Europe, leaving her behind and belonging "neither to the West nor to the East".[9] Russian culture was purely imitative.

> Alone in the world, we have given nothing to the world, taken nothing from the world, bestowed not even a single idea upon the fund of human ideas, contributed nothing to the progress of the human spirit, and we have distorted all progressivity which has come to us.

Here he praised Peter I for trying to unite Russia with civilization. But Chaadaev saw little hope for Russia in the short term.

> We are one of those nations which does not seem to form an integral part of humanity, but which exists only to provide some great lesson for the world.[10]

The publication of the first letter in 1836 shocked Russian society in its mood of national self-satisfaction. Nicholas had Chaadaev declared insane but did not deprive him of liberty. The following year Chaadaev produced his "Apologia of a Madman", expressing rather different views. But this was not a sudden change, a forced recantation. The July revolution of 1830 in France had undermined his faith in Europe; the aristocratic structures which Chaadaev admired were crumbling. In 1835 he wrote: "it is Europe to whom we shall teach an infinity of things which she could not conceive without us…great things have always come from the desert."[11]

In the "Apologia", Chaadaev wrote: "In his land Peter the Great found only a blank sheet of paper, and he wrote on it: Europe and [the] West; since then we belonged to Europe and to the West."[12] Following Peter's road, Chaadaev thought that Russia would do great things:

> I think that if we have come after the others, it is in order to do better than the others… I have the inner conviction that we are called upon to resolve most of the problems in the social order, to accomplish most of the ideas which arose in the old societies, to make a pronouncement about those very grave questions which occupy humanity.[13]

His view that Russia was divinely chosen for a special mission reflected his discussions with Ivan Kireevsky and others who later became Slavophils. Joseph Frank has written that Chaadaev "provided Russian Messianism with a philosophical foundation"[14] with his theory of the advantages of backwardness. Chaadaev's sharp differences with the Slavophils were not related only to his pro-Catholic sympathies. While Chaadaev's unique version of Russian messianism was rooted in support for Peter, the Slavophil version looked to Russian traditions which Peter had disrupted; and whereas Chaadaev looked to the elite as the main agency of Russia's development, the Slavophils looked to the common people.[15]

Pushkin and Gogol

Two writers of creative literature who made contributions to official *narodnost'* merit special attention: Aleksandr S.Pushkin (1799–1837) and Nikolai V.Gogol (1809–52). One constant in Pushkin's views was a strong Russian nationalism.[16] In 1831, when the tsarist army crushed the Polish uprising, this was bitterly opposed by public opinion in Europe and by progressive thinkers in Russia; but Pushkin wrote "To the Slanderers of Russia" in which he told the West to mind its own business. The Polish revolt was "just a quarrel of Slavs among ourselves"; Russia had spilt blood protecting Europe from the Mongol hordes.[17] This theme of Russia as suffering to protect others was an important component of Russian messianism.

Gogol's image in *Dead Souls* (1842) of Russia as a troika travelling into an unknown future has become famous. His *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends* (1847) are animated not only by support for the political and social systems existing in Russia, but also by a deep religious feeling (or desire for faith).[18] The Church can solve all the problems of the world; and by the Church Gogol means the Russian Orthodox Church, for he believed in the particular religious calling of the Russian people and the uniqueness of the "Russian soul". "In our land before any other, the bright resurrection of Christ will be celebrated." Gogol believed that Russia was called upon to create a new Christian culture, which would be a prelude to the end of the world.[19] "Why does Russia alone act as a prophet? Because she feels more keenly than others the hand of God in everything that comes to pass within her, and senses the approach of another kingdom."[20] Gogol was at pains to distance himself from jingoism. "We are no better than anyone else, and our life is more unsettled and disorderly

than all of theirs."[21] But nevertheless: "The great task which is impossible for any other peoples, is possible only for the Russian people."[22]

Slavophilism and the Slavophils

It is not possible to point to a body of doctrine and say that that was what the Slavophils believed. They did not form an organized, disciplined group; they had differences among themselves; and in some cases their views changed over time, with the result that people who had become known as Slavophils came to support ideas which were not shared by the original Slavophils. The very term Slavophil was subject to different meanings. Peter K.Christoff says that Slavophilism as such did not exist, only a number of individual Slavophils.[23] Marc Raeff maintains that Slavophilism was not a coherent system, but a mood.[24]

The "golden age" of Slavophilism ran from the mid-1840s and through the 1850s. The leading Slavophils came from a common background: they were from old, traditional, gentry families, although most opposed serfdom; they were all well-educated, and most were related by blood and marriage. All spent at least some of their formative years in Moscow; and Khomiakov, the Kireevsky brothers and the Aksakov brothers all attended the University of Moscow. It is often forgotten that around half the population of Moscow at this time were Old Believers, the traditional opponents of Westernization.[25] It would be wrong to say that anti-Western feeling was basic to the original Slavophils; they were not even in agreement over their attitude to Peter I.Zenkovsky is right to note that the essential difference between the Slavophils and the Westernizers was the Slavophil view of Orthodoxy as the foundation of Russian national originality *(samobytnost')*.[26] Indeed this was perhaps the central element of Slavophilism. The adherents of official *narodnost'* also claimed to proceed from this view, but their usually servile attitude to the regime marked them off from the Slavophils. Rather than creating an "ideal type" of Slavophilism that no real person actually believed in, it seems appropriate to outline the views of the most influential Slavophils insofar as they are relevant to the subject of this study.

Khomiakov

Khomiakov was steeped in Orthodoxy all his life. Beginning in 1829, his view of Russia's world mission and her role as leader of the Slavs appeared in his poetry, and he developed Slavophilism from the late 1830s. His major theological contribution was the concept of *sobornost'*. This meant for Khomiakov the "togetherness" and "oneness" of Christian believers, the collectivity and unity which he held could be found only in the Orthodox Church. Freedom could be gained not by the individual alone but through the collective, in this *sobornost'*. The adjective *sobornyi,* he said, represented in Church Slavonic the Greek *katholikos* (catholic, universal); and he asserted that *katholikos* meant "according

to all". The universal Church, then, was the Church "according to all" the believers; it represented the "free unanimity" of the beliefs of its members.[27]

In his essay "On Humboldt" (probably written in 1849 but published posthumously) he attacked the Western churches for leaving behind this "free unanimity". "Christianity…propounded the ideas of unity and freedom indissolubly combined in the *moral law of mutual love*." But legalistic, rationalistic Roman Catholicism believed that freedom was antagonistic to unity, and sacrificed freedom in favour of an external unity. The "one-sidedness" of Rome eventually led to the emergence of Protestantism, which sacrificed the idea of unity to the idea of freedom. Protestantism, in its turn, by retreating from dogma degenerated into scepticism and rationalism; this produced a revolutionary ferment in Western politics. Alternative philosophies such as Hegelianism, socialism and communism were isolated from religion and therefore had collapsed or were about to collapse. The only alternative was Orthodoxy, whose standard-bearer was Russia.[28]

Khomiakov was not satisfied, however, with the actual situation of the Russian Orthodox Church. He believed that the task of the Church was to regenerate the whole of human life, including its social and economic aspects. He was unhappy at the close links between Church and State, although he claimed that the Church had retained its spiritual independence. Khomiakov's theological works could not be published in Russia in his lifetime (although some appeared abroad).

Khomiakov's view of the traditional peasant commune *(obshchina)* governed by the meeting of its members *(mir)* was an extension into the social sphere of his concept of *sobornost'*. Customarily, the decisions of the *mir* were unanimous and binding on their members, and were freely accepted. He saw in the *obshchina* the germs of a new society. The principle would not necessarily be destroyed by industrialization because of the tradition of co-operation among artisans in the small collective enterprise *(artel')*. The alternative to the preservation of collective customs was "the concentration of property in relatively few hands", and the "consignment to the proletariat" of most of the population.[29]

Even though Khomiakov believed that the West had made a positive contribution to world culture, he was in no doubt that this was coming to an end. "The age has passed and the entire West is covered with the shroud of death."[30] The path from Catholicism via Protestantism to rationalism and individualism could go no further except to collapse so long as the West remained bound by its own "principles". But there was light ahead. Russians were now returning to their native "principles", such as Orthodoxy and the *obshchina,* and Russia now had to save the West.

> History calls Russia to be at the forefront of universal enlightenment; it gives her this right because of the all-roundedness and fullness of her principles, and a right given by history to a people is a duty imposed on each of its members.[31]

Ivan Kireevsky

Ivan Kireevsky, the philosopher of Slavophilism, differed from Khomiakov in that he reverted to Orthodoxy and became a Slavophil after a period of "Westernism". The clearest expression of his philosophy of history is his article "On the Nature of European Culture and Its Relation to the Culture of Russia" published in the Slavophils' *Moskovskii sbornik (Moscow Compendium)* in 1852.[32] "The sources of Russian culture," argued Kireevsky, "are totally different from the elements composing the culture of the European peoples".[33] He considered three elements of Western culture to be "entirely alien to old Russia".[34] The most important of these was the influence of Roman Catholicism, which had split from the universal Church. Russia, on the other hand, had remained constantly in touch with the universal Church. Second, the influence of ancient Roman civilization was reflected in the mentality of the West. The Roman mentality was dominated by law rather than justice, form rather than content, and reason rather than faith. This mentality led to the formation of separate political parties, pursuing their own interests and policies at the expense of the State, and thence to revolution. Third, the European states arose from conquest and were divided along class lines.[35]

Konstantin Aksakov

Much of the thought and activity of the Aksakov brothers, and of Samarin and Koshelyov, belongs chronologically to the next chapter. Konstantin Aksakov, whose major concern was with history, was the most extreme of the early Slavophils. His nationalist orientation began as a child, when he would burn notes written in French, and lasted his whole life. It was only at the end of his life that he went abroad, and died on an Aegean island. Despite his early enthusiasm for Peter's attempts to bring European education to Russia, by the mid-1840s he was on the way to Slavophilism.[36] His poem "To Peter" (1845) accused the Emperor of despising and repressing the people "with a blooded axe". Peter's capital city was a threat to "Rus'", but the people would return to freedom "with their ancient Moscow".[37]

In 1847 he wrote: "Peter the Great brought in alien principles, but the national principles have been preserved to the present in the simple Russian people."[38] In the same vein, his article on the 700th anniversary of Moscow in *Moskovskie vedomosti (Moscow Tidings),* also published in 1846, declared that the old capital was still Russia's eternal national centre. It was "the true capital of Holy Rus'",[39] i.e. of the Orthodox peasant masses, in contrast to the Petersburg government and elite. Moscow's significance was not merely Russian, but universal; for the Russian people were characterized by their faith in universal principles. Elsewhere Aksakov developed this idea.

> The Russian people is not a people; it is humanity; it is a people only because it is surrounded by peoples with exclusively national essences, and its humanity is therefore represented as nationality. The Russian people is free, it has no state element in itself.[40]

This anticipates Dostoevsky's idea of the Russian as the "universal person".

Pan-Slavism

Khomiakov had volunteered and fought the Turks in Bulgaria in 1828. He, Konstantin Aksakov and Samarin supported the unsuccessful efforts of the Croat, Ljudevit Gaj, to secure Russian military aid to create a South Slav union in 1838–40. But a concern for the Slavs outside the Empire was not an important part of Slavophilism until the Crimean War. Some of the Slavs were not Orthodox, and Orthodoxy was the basis of Slavophilism. Ivan Aksakov in 1849 explained that the Slavophils could not support pan-Slavism, the movement for the unity of all Slavs, because of the Catholicism and liberalism of some of the other Slavs.[41] The very name "Slavophil" is confusing here, applied as it was to them initially by their opponents; their affinity was specifically for Russian traditions, and they wished these traditions to penetrate all humanity, not just the Slavs.

Pogodin subscribed to pan-Slavism but his version changed in form several times. It varied from defending the rights of the Slavs in Austria and Turkey, through the idea of Slav federation, to the total unity of all Slavs under tsarism. Belief in Russia's messianic role was a constant theme. The nationalist flavour of his speeches and writings is captured in his "Letter on Russian History" (1837).

> Russia, what country can compare with thee in magnitude? …A population of sixty million people… Let us add to it thirty million more of our brothers and sisters, the Slavs…in whose veins flow the same blood as ours, who speak the same language as we do *[sic!],* and who feel, therefore, according to the laws of nature, as we do…I ask: who can compare with us? Whom will we not force into submission? Is not the political fate of the world in our hands whenever we want to decide it one way or the other? [42]

Pogodin's letter was addressed to the future Alexander II, but the official to whom Pogodin sent it refused to forward it, since it contradicted the official policy against pan-Slavism.[43]

More lyrical than Pogodin in his support for pan-Slavism was the poet Tiutchev. In a poem of 1831, on the suppression of Poland, he wrote: "Not for the Koran of autocracy did Russian blood flow in a river…[but] to gather under a single Russian banner the kindred generations of Slavs."[44] His ambitions for

Russia were made clear in his poem "Russian Geography" (1848): "From the Nile to the Neva, from the Elbe to China, from the Volga to the Euphrates, from the Ganges to the Danube, This is the Russian Kingdom."[45] This poem referred to three "sacred capitals" of Russia as Moscow, the City of Peter and the "City of Constantine". Tiutchev's "Prophecy" (1850) envisaged the Russian Emperor setting up an altar in Byzantium; he would kneel before it and "rise up as the pan-Slavonic Tsar". "Dawn" (1850) spoke of the title in the Bosphorus glowing red, and continued: "O, Rus', the approaching day is great—the universal and Orthodox day". The messianic theme is of Russian self-sacrifice for the Slavs.[46] In plainer language, *Russia and Germany* (1844) called for Russia to expand into a "Graeco-Russian Orthodox Empire" which would be capable of reforming the papacy and creating a universal church.[47]

Tiutchev's major contribution to the development of Russian messianism was the view that Russia's mission was to prevent revolution in Europe. He put this forward in "La Russie et la Revolution" (April 1848).

> For a long time there have been in Europe only two real powers: the Revolution and Russia…the life of the one means the death of the other.
>
> Russia is above all the Christian Empire… The Revolution is above all anti-Christian.

The revolution represented the absolutism of the human ego, substituting itself for God.

> In this war to the death, in this ungodly crusade which the Revolution, already the mistress of three-fourths of Western Europe, prepares against Russia, the Christian East, the Slav Orthodox East, whose life is indissolubly bound up with ours, will by necessity enter the struggle on our side.

Tiutchev thought it "impossible" that the Tsar would fail to intervene against the revolution.[48]

Nicholas I was committed to halting the revolutions in Europe. But by this very token he could not encourage the Slavs outside the Empire to overthrow their rulers and join Russia. As much as Alexander I, he equated autocracy at home with legitimism and opposition to nationalism and liberalism abroad. The Russian government banned Russians from attending the Slav Congress held in Prague in 1848. That year, the Russian army crushed the anti-Turkish revolt of the Orthodox Romanians on behalf of the Ottomans. The following year, in perhaps his most well-known counter-revolutionary act, Nicholas saved the Habsburg Empire by destroying the Hungarian revolution.[49]

Tolerance and repression

Both the nationalist wing of official *narodnost'* and the Slavophils suffered from the attentions of the State. The Slavophils suffered more; they were denied the professorships awarded to Pogodin and Shevyryov, and their publications were more likely to be banned than not. The Tsar banned Pogodin's hagiographic play *Peter* because he thought it almost blasphemous to portray his predecessor on stage. Nicholas was reluctant to permit the appearance of *Moskvitianin,* but because it opposed the Westernizers he agreed to it on condition that it be strictly supervised. A report to Uvarov of 1842 drew attention to the dangers of the journal's talk about the liberation of the Slavs. Khomiakov had attracted the Tsar's displeasure as early as 1839 with his sympathy for the Slavs, and was put under surveillance. Ivan Kireevsky was permitted to edit *Moskvitianin* in 1845, and the Slavophils published two editions of the annual *Moskovskii sbornik* in 1846 and 1847. After Uvarov's circular of 1847 against pan-Slavism, the Slavophils came under more pressure, and the Governor-General of Moscow, Count A.A. Zakrevsky, (according to Aleksandr Koshelyov) on occasion referred to them as "red" and "communists".[50]

In 1848, frightened by the revolutions, Nicholas tightened the censorship. Khomiakov seems to have hoped that the revolutions would facilitate the spread of Orthodoxy. He complained privately about the censorship. His fellow Slavophil Ivan Kireevsky not only refused to join Pogodin in a petition to loosen the controls on literature, but even argued that they were necessary to help the government fight revolution. Kireevsky's appearance on the side of the government was brought on by a fear which, according to Riasanovsky, "made him betray the most cherished beliefs of the Slavophils" in relation to both censorship and serfdom.[51] Konstantin Aksakov wrote to the Tsar in March 1848 in support of his manifesto against revolution, but argued that in order to fight revolution, Nicholas should re-establish Russian traditions. Not surprisingly, this increased the Emperor's suspicion of the Slavophils. In March 1849, Samarin was arrested after circulating a manuscript, "Letters from Riga", advocating the Russification of the Baltic Provinces and the ending of the privileges of the Baltic German barons. He spent twelve days in prison and the Tsar personally rebuked him. In the same month, Ivan Aksakov was briefly arrested for political criticism in his letters. In spite of the latter's dissociation from pan-Slavism, Nicholas marked his file with the comment that pan-Slavists sought to encourage rebellion against Russia's allies to the disadvantage of Russia. On top of this the Tsar forbade Konstantin Aksakov to wear his "Russian beard" because of the revolutionary connotations of beards in Western Europe.[52]

Even the dynastic wing of the supporters of official *narodnost'* suffered from the events of 1848–1849. Uvarov had been more favourably disposed towards pan-Slav feeling than the Emperor had. Furthermore, his emphasis on Orthodoxy and *narodnost'* may have been inconvenient at a time when the Orthodox Church was being prevented from expanding in the Baltic provinces. Increasingly

dependent on what the Slavophils called the "German Party" at Court, Nicholas sacked Uvarov and replaced him with a still more reactionary bureaucrat, Prince Plato Shirinsky-Shikhmatov. Generally speaking, oppression and censorship were even worse from 1848 to 1855 than in Nicholas's earlier years. Nevertheless, the Slavophils received permission for another *Moskovskii sbornik* volume, which appeared in 1852. The collection worried the government, who demanded to see in Petersburg the manuscripts for the next volume prior to publication. The government then banned the volume and the rest of the series. Five leading contributors—the Aksakov brothers, Khomiakov, Kireevsky and Prince V.A.Cherkassky—were put under surveillance and banned from publishing anything without special permission from Petersburg. In this atmosphere, Pogodin found himself condemning the regime for introducing "the quiet of a graveyard, rotting and stinking, both physically and morally".[53]

Russian messianism and the Crimean War

The Crimean War was, for Pogodin, Tiutchev and Khomiakov, the time for the enactment of Russia's world-historical mission. Pogodin broke completely from the dynastic wing of the official ideology, demanding a total reversal of Russian foreign policy, the encouragement of Slav revolutions and the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. For both security and religious reasons, he argued, Russia should take Constantinople, which would become the capital of the Slav federation. Tiutchev also expected the capture of Constantinople, a united Slavdom and the realization of the Orthodox Kingdom. He was filled with messianic, eschatological expectations of the final decisive struggle between Russia and the West. Russia was at the "edge of the abyss", and it was "quite simply, the end of the world".[54] Konstantin Aksakov hoped for Constantinople and the creation of independent Slav states under Russian protection.[55] Ivan Kireevsky and Khomiakov saw the Crimean War as a "holy war" waged by Catholic France, allied with Britain and Turkey, against Russia.[56]

In his enthusiasm for the war, Khomiakov outdid the other Slavophils. His poem "Rossii" ("To Russia"), composed in 1854 on the eve of the outbreak of the war, remains controversial. The message of the poem is that in spite of her unworthiness, Russia has been chosen to be God's instrument in war. His earlier poem of the same title (written in 1839) had referred to Russia's mission to bring God's word to all peoples, but had warned Russia against pride. The 1854 poem thus seems to put forward a similar position, but the final verse is more aggressive, referring to "bloody battles" and ending "Smite with the sword—the sword of God". The Slavophils, defending Khomiakov, emphasized his critical comments about Russia, and Brodsky writing in 1910 considered the final verse "out of place and superfluous".[57]

Khomiakov tells Russia that God is calling her to fight for her brothers (the Slavs). He castigates the evils of Russia, including "the yoke of serfdom", and continues: "O, unworthy of election, you were chosen! Wash yourself speedily

with the water of repentance!" Official circles were horrified by the poem, and the government required him to give a guarantee not to distribute any of his verses without permission from St Petersburg. Khomiakov wrote that he supposed it was "impossible even to imagine that such a canon of penitence could be published".[58]

Before the end of the Crimean War, Nicholas was dead. Russian messianism had flourished in his reign, with the different versions reacting on one another. Neither messianism nor nationalism were encouraged by the government; rather the official ideology promoted a chauvinistic attitude towards the State, devotion to the autocrat and the political passivity of the Russian people. Some of the Russian nationalists could accept some of these ideas.

Nicholas's reign does not bear out Aleksandr Ianov's contention of a convergence of Russian nationalist dissent with the State.[59] Pogodin, indeed, was going in the other direction. In subsequent years, admittedly, as will be seen, the Slavophils moved towards pan-Slavism. But already by the end of the 1840s, Khomiakov's views on the *obshchina* had formed the basis for Herzen's version of Russian messianism, which was to develop into the anti-tsarist *narodnichestvo* movement.

3
Pro-Tsarist forms of Russian messianism: Pan-Slavism, Dostoevsky and Solovyov

The death of Nicholas I, the accession of Alexander II (1855–81) and the easing of censorship gave rise in Russia to hopes of political and social improvements being introduced from above. Slavophilism developed in a number of directions, most of which retained the elements of the messianic core. I shall deal now with those versions which accepted the tsarist system: the pan-Slavists, the *pochvenniki* and Dostoevsky, Leontev, Fyodorov and Vladimir Solovyov. Dostoevsky occupies a central position. I consider in the next chapter the revolutionaries, the narodniks and Marxists.

From Slavophilism to pan-Slavism

The Slavophils had never been revolutionaries, and the more relaxed political environment enabled them to play a larger public role than hitherto. Before the end of 1855, Konstantin Aksakov submitted to Alexander his memorandum "On the Internal Condition of Russia".[1] This important Slavophil document appealed for a "return" to the situation which, Aksakov alleged, existed before Peter I, with the government tolerating freedom of opinion. The danger was that, deprived of their inner social freedom, Russians would seek external political freedom. They would be drawn away from the Russian "soil" *(pochva)* into support for revolutionary ventures.[2]

Aksakov claimed that the people wanted only freedom to live, freedom of the spirit and freedom of speech. In restoring these, the government would be returning to Russian principles, without sacrificing autocracy. "Freedom of speech is an inalienable human right". Over a century before Gorbachev, Konstantin Aksakov demanded *"glasnost'"*.[3] It is now known that Alexander saw the memorandum.[4] He may not have been influenced by it, but he made concessions to its spirit by liberalizing censorship and the Slavophils were allowed to produce a number of journals in the course of his reign. Samarin, Koshelyov and Cherkassky were involved in official bodies planning the emancipation of the serfs, which the Tsar implemented in 1861.[5]

In 1858 the Moscow Slav Benevolent Committee was formed, initially as a charitable organization to help Christians in the Ottoman Empire. Khomiakov,

Konstantin Aksakov, Samarin and Koshelyov were among the founder members, and Pogodin and Ivan Aksakov played leading roles. Foreign Minister A.M.Gorchakov spoke of the "necessity" to aid the Orthodox. The Tsarina, the Tsarevich (the future Alexander III) and the Church all helped the Committee.[6]

A link between Ivan Aksakov and the Foreign Ministry was provided by Tiutchev, who was Aksakov's father-in-law. In 1858 Tiutchev was put in charge of the Foreign Censorship Committee. He continued to favour pan-Slavism. In the aftermath of the Crimean War he had become bitterly critical of the late Tsar, Nicholas, and, it seems, more sympathetic to the Slavophil emphasis on the Russian people. His belief in Russia is expressed in these often-quoted lines.

> One cannot understand Russia with the mind.
> One cannot measure her with a common yardstick.
> She has a special status.
> One can only believe in Russia.[7]

One of the last documents of classical Slavophilism before its leaders died or became mainly concerned with pan-Slavism was Khomiakov's "Letter to the Serbs", published abroad in 1860. This exhorted the newly independent nation to remain true to Orthodox tradition and reject Westernism. Khomiakov referred to Russia's racial as well as religious links to the Serbs, and criticized the Orthodox (but not Slav) Greeks for their alleged pride. The letter was also signed by, among others, the Aksakov brothers, Samarin, Koshelyov and Pogodin.[8]

Ivan and Pyotr Kireevsky had died in 1856; Konstantin Aksakov and Khomiakov died in 1860, leaving Ivan Aksakov to become the leading Slavophil. In 1861, despite police objections, the Tsar gave Ivan Aksakov permission to publish in Moscow a weekly newspaper, *Den' (The Day)* on condition that it did not have a "political section".[9] The lifetime of *Den',* from 1861 to 1865, saw the victory of pan-Slavism over the old Slavophilism.

Ivan Aksakov wrote in the first issue:

> *to free the Slav peoples from material and spiritual oppression* and to give them the gift of *independent* spiritual and, very likely, *political* existence under the protection of the powerful wings of the Russian eagle—that is the historical vocation, the moral right and the obligation of Russia.[10]

Aksakov saw the liberation of the Slavs as a national task, the accomplishment of which would overcome Peter's division of Russia. Undergoing sacrifice through war and death, the country would achieve redemption. Thus, Aksakov maintained the messianist idea of redemption through suffering, but linked it to the goals of the Russian State more openly than Khomiakov had in the Crimean War. Russia, moreover, was to be the Messiah not for all Europe, but only for the Slavs.

Slavophilism and *pochvennichestvo*

The tendency known as *pochvennichestvo,* which has enjoyed a revival among Russian writers since the 1970s, was influenced by the ideas of the Slavophils. The ideas of *pochvennichestvo* emerged in the St Petersburg journals *Vremia* (*Time,* 1861–3) and its successor *Epokha* (*The Epoch,* 1864–5). The core of the editorial board of *Vremia* was composed of the writer Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky (1821–81), his brother Mikhail, Apollon Aleksandrovich Grigorev (1822–64) and the critic Nikolai Nikolaevich Strakhov (1828–96). Fyodor Dostoevsky was the leading figure. Born and brought up in Moscow, he lived most of his adult life in Siberia, Petersburg and abroad. His interest in Fourier's Utopian socialism and participation in the Petrashevsky circle in 1848 led to his mock execution and hard labour in Siberia and the beginnings of his reverence for the Russian peasant.[11]

The position of *pochvennichestvo* was one of reconciliation—the reconciliation of Russia and the West, of Slavophils and Westernizers, of the educated society with the people and the soil *(pochva)*. *Pochvennichestvo* has been translated as "native soil" or "return to the soil", and Strakhov in 1862 explained that "soil" had the connotation of the unique characteristics of the Russian people. The *pochvenniki* rejected the idea that Europe represented the universal ideal. Europe was only part of this ideal, and Russia, like every nation, had its own principle and role to play in this ideal. Russian *narodnost',* for Dostoevsky, was the ability to synthesize Russian and Western ideas. As he said in the *Vremia* manifesto in autumn 1860: "the Russian idea will perhaps be the synthesis of all those ideas which Europe with such obstinacy, with such courage, is developing in its separate nationalities".[12]

Reflecting Pogodin's influence, the *pochvenniki* supported Peter's reforms and saw them as a necessary element of Russian universalism. Dostoevsky recognized that Peter's reforms had been rejected by the common people, but considered that, contrary to the Slavophil belief, the people had not preserved pre-Petrine customs. Russian nationality existed not only in the peasants but also in the educated people.

Pan-Slavism, 1867±78: Danilevsky

I shall now turn to discuss the development of the pan-Slav movement and the ideas behind it. Dostoevsky's later thought will be considered below.

From 1867, branches of the Moscow Slav Committee appeared in St Petersburg, Kiev and Odessa, but they were all fairly small. Among the participants in the Petersburg section were Tiutchev, Samarin, Dostoevsky, Strakhov and Nikolai lakovlevich Danilevsky (1822–95). Russian pan-Slavism was now changing its emphasis "from spiritual right to political might".[13] Aksakov wrote in *Moskvich (The Muscovite),* a weekly he edited for Moscow merchants: "All [the] historical traditions of Russia are rooted in her Slavonic

origin".[14] This shift from religion to race as the basis of Slav unity was reflected in the works of Count Nikolai Ignatev, General Rostislav Fadeev and Danilevsky. Ignatev, ambassador in Constantinople from 1864 to 1877, found that his racially-based political pan-Slavism aroused hostility in Gorchakov and other government ministers. Fadeev's *Opinion on the Eastern Question* (1869) advocated a pan-Slav federation under Russian leadership, created by Russian force, using Orthodoxy as a propaganda tool.[15] Danilevsky's "Russia and Europe" (completed in 1869)[16] was published in Strakhov's St Petersburg journal *Zaria (Dawn)*.

Strakhov described "Russia and Europe" as "a whole code *(kodeks)* of Slavophil doctrine".[17] Danilevsky rejected the primacy of Orthodoxy, but he still linked Slav destiny with religion:

> From an objective, factual viewpoint, the Russian and the majority of the other Slav peoples achieved the historical destiny of becoming, with the Greeks, the chief guardians of the living tradition of religious truth, Orthodoxy, and in this way the continuers of the great cause, which was the lot of Israel and Byzantium: to be the God-chosen peoples *(narodami bogoizbrannymi)*.[18]

Danilevsky believed that Peter's political and military activity had been beneficial, but he agreed with the early Slavophils that his attempt to uproot customs and morals "brought the greatest harm".[19] He wrote, "Our *obshchina* is a historical law",[20] and he believed in a form of "Russian socialism" linked with it. The Russians' humility and obedience meant that Russia had never had, and probably would never have, a political revolution. Danilevsky, however, differed from the early Slavophils in rejecting their belief that the State was an evil. He stood for a strong state. He also rejected the Slavophil view that Russia had a mission to perform in Europe. He denied the existence of universal civilization, and argued instead that civilizations could be divided into a number of historical-cultural types. Here he anticipated by over a century Samuel P.Huntington's theory of the "clash of civilizations". For Danilevsky, Russia was not part of the "Germano-Roman" civilization of Europe, which he believed to be in decline, but belonged to Slav civilization, a different historical-cultural type. He claimed that Europe hated Russia, with a blind racial hatred, and racial hatred was the motive force of history. Russia's foreign policy should henceforth be determined not by legitimism or the "Holy Alliance", but by the Slav interest. The aim should be to destroy the Habsburg and Ottoman Empires and unite the Slavs in a Slav Federation under the Russian Tsar.[21]

Ivan Aksakov considered Danilevsky's "Russia and Europe" to be a Slavophil work. Partly under its influence, his desire for cultural and spiritual Slav unity gave way to a "striving, by political and military means, to expedite the liberation of the southern Slavs and achieve their inclusion in Russia's sphere of influence".[22] Aksakov's opportunity for engendering mass support came with the

outbreak of conflict in the Balkans: a revolt in Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1875, and the revolt in Bulgaria and the war of Serbia and Montenegro against Turkey in 1876.[23]

Alexander and Gorchakov refused to be drawn into a war against Turkey on behalf of the Slavs, but the Moscow merchants gave huge funds to help the Slavs and to finance Russian volunteers to fight for Serbia. This aid was co-ordinated through the Moscow Slav Committee, headed by Aksakov. At the same time, the pan-Slavists campaigned for official Russian intervention against Turkey. Aksakov saw the direct involvement of not only the Russian people but of Russia "as a *State* organism, headed by the government" as essential to solving the Slav question.[24] Following the collapse of Serbia in February 1877, Aksakov made a bitter attack on Russian diplomacy for betraying Russian popular sympathy for the Slavs. Finally, on 12 April 1877 Russia declared war on Turkey.

This declaration of war, against the opposition of the Foreign Ministry and Alexander's own former opinion, deserves some consideration. In earlier periods of Russian history, as suggested above, ideological pronouncements about the Tsar being the protector of the Orthodox had not been allowed to weigh against the interests of the State. The interests of dynasties had been predominant. It would seem that the declaration of war resulted not primarily from outside pressure, from Aksakov and others, on the State apparatus, but from support for war that existed within the ruling circles. Russia helped the Bulgarians to gain autonomy, but in 1878 at the Congress of Berlin was forced to give up much of what it had won. Aksakov denounced these Russian concessions and was exiled from Moscow.[25]

Dostoevsky

On Dostoevsky's return from Western Europe to St Petersburg in 1871, his literary fame was already established by *Crime and Punishment* (1865–66), The *Idiot* (1869) and *The Devils* (1871). In 1872 he met Konstantin P.Pobedonostsev (1827–1907). Pobedonostsev had been tutor to the Tsarevich and was later to become Oberprocurator of the Holy Synod (1880–1905) and a prominent adviser to Alexander III and Nicholas II. The two became very close friends. At the end of 1872, Dostoevsky was made editor of *Grazhdanin (The Citizen),* a conservative journal owned by Prince V.P.Meshchersky and supported by the Tsarevich, Pobedonostsev, Apollon Maikov, Tiutchev and Strakhov. He held the position for a year; his *Diary of a Writer* originated as a feature within the journal and was published separately between 1876 and 1881. It gained a wide circulation, peaking at 6,000 in 1877. Pobedonostsev introduced Dostoevsky to Court circles, where he made a favourable impression. Alexander II invited him to have discussions with his two younger sons, Sergei and Pavel, and the sons of his brother. In 1880 he met the Tsarevich. At the same time, he maintained links with radical circles.[26]

Having accepted the centrality of Orthodoxy, Dostoevsky became very close politically to the Slavophils, especially Ivan Aksakov, and at times was if anything even more virulent in his nationalism. In the *Diary* for September 1877, during the Russo-Turkish War, Dostoevsky's expectations of the defeat of European ideas reached new heights. "Papal Catholicism, dying forever" would in the very near future launch a war against the whole world, which would merge with the Balkan war. The outcome would be that Catholicism would be replaced by "reborn Eastern Christianity".[27] The ending of the Russo-Turkish War in no way diminished his expectations of a forthcoming conflagration. The political situation within the European countries, he wrote in the *Diary* for August 1880, "must unfailingly lead to a huge, final, partitioning political war", within the nineteenth century or even the decade. In Europe, "the proletarian is on the street…[the proletarians] will throw themselves on Europe, and all the old order will perish for ever."[28]

Dostoevsky claimed that Catholicism and atheist socialism both sought to deny people their freedom in order to try to give them happiness. His portrayal of Shigalyov's attempt to create paradise in *The Devils* and of the ideology of the Grand Inquisitor in *The Brothers Karamazov* are probably attacks on both Catholicism and socialism. Shigalyov proposes to give

> one-tenth of humanity absolute freedom and unlimited rights over the remaining nine-tenths. The latter must lose their individuality and turn into something like a herd, and by their unlimited obedience will achieve, by a series of regenerations, primeval innocence, something like the original paradise, although, however, they will work.

But Shigalyov finds a paradox: "Proceeding from unlimited freedom, I conclude with unlimited despotism."[29] The Grand Inquisitor explains to Christ, who has returned to Seville at the height of the Spanish Inquisition, that people do not want to be burdened with the freedom that Christ gave them. People have instead given their freedom to the Church, and in return received "bread", a symbol for the certainties of Catholic dogma. The Church has taken on itself the burden of the sins of the people, and the people willingly submit to the Church. The Grand Inquisitor admits that, in denying people freedom, the Catholic Church has abandoned Christ for "him", the Devil or Antichrist.[30] Mochulsky sees the bread as symbolizing both Catholicism and socialism and argues that Dostoevsky was convinced that Catholicism would unite with socialism to form the kingdom of Antichrist.[31]

Dostoevsky believed that atheism among the Russian intelligentsia was a result of its separation from the people. "Cutting themselves off from the people, they naturally also lost God."[32] The consequence of the loss of God was the ending of morality and the raising of man to be a god. In *The Devils,* Kirillov becomes a man-god in his own eyes by overcoming the fear of death and killing himself.[33] The whole novel can be seen in terms of the loss of morality in the

"nihilist sons" of the 1860s as a result of the loss of God by the "liberal fathers" of the 1840s. Pyotr Verkhovensky, a "nihilist son", organizes the murder of one of the members of his secret revolutionary cell. The story is based on a similar incident in 1869 involving Sergei G.Nechaev, who had earlier collaborated with Mikhail A.Bakunin on the *Catechism of the Revolutionary*. Dostoevsky emphasizes that Pyotr Verkhovensky is not a socialist but simply a scoundrel.

The irrational, depraved, nightmarish world Dostoevsky portrays has inevitably been compared with Stalinism. Philip Rahv wrote at the height of the Great Purge: "Give him [Pyotr Verkhovensky] state power and you get a type like Yezhov or Yagoda". At the end of the novel appears a vision: the "devils" who have supposedly been afflicting Russia over the ages enter the liberals and nihilists and destroy themselves, like the swine in St. Luke's Gospel. Russia is then healed, and "will sit at the feet of Jesus". Rahv argues that Dostoevsky was demonstrating the inevitability of the Russian Revolution; but the conclusion to be drawn from this vision, and from his journalism already cited, might be that he believed that the revolution would be defeated.[34] It is difficult to disagree with Andrzej Walicki's view that Shigalyov's paradox "is a fairly accurate description of what happened in Russia".[35]

The philosophy behind *The Devils* is made more explicit in *The Brothers Karamazov*. Ivan Karamazov propounds the view that if, as he believes, there is no God and no immortality, then "everything is permitted".[36] The murder of Karamazov *père* by Smerdiakov, who had heard Ivan express this opinion, and Ivan's reaction, are central themes in the novel. Commentators on Dostoevsky have nevertheless had to face the problem of whether the author really believed in God. From his journalistic writings, the question would appear facile, but his novels provide room for doubt.

Shatov is the character in *The Devils* who most clearly represents Dostoevsky's Russian messianism. After Shatov's exposition of the idea that the Russian people is a "God-bearing people" *(narod-bogonosets),* Stavrogin asks him:

"Do you yourself believe in God or not?"
"I believe in Russia, I believe in her Orthodoxy… I believe in the body of Christ… I believe that the Second Coming will take place in Russia… I believe…"
(Shatov began to babble in a frenzy.)
"But in God? In God?"
"I…I shall believe in God."[37]

Shatov is vehement in his belief in the Russian people. It is

> now the only 'God-bearing' people in the whole world, destined to renew and save the world in the name of a new God, and to whom alone

> have been given the keys of life and of the new word… The purpose of the whole movement of a people…is solely the pursuit of God, its own God

God is the synthetic personality of the whole people. A people begins to die when it shares its God with other peoples.

> The people is the body of God. Every people is a people only as long as it has its own special God, and excludes all other gods in the world without any reconciliation; while it believes that by its own God it will conquer and drive from the world all the other gods… If a great people does not believe that in it alone there is truth *(istina)* (precisely in it alone and precisely exclusively), if it does not believe that it alone is able and called on to raise up and save all by its truth, then at once it ceases to be a great people and at once is converted into ethnographic material, and not into a great people.[38]

The view that this was the creed of Dostoevsky himself is born out by its reiteration in *The Diary of a* Waiter for January 1877. Dostoevsky wrote:

> Every great people believes and must believe, if only it wishes to be alive for long, that the salvation of the world is in it, and only in it alone; that it lives in order to stand at the head of the peoples, to join them all to itself in unity, and to lead them in a harmonious choir to the final purpose, predestined for them all.

He went on to commend the "ideal of the Slavophils", which he interpreted as the universal unity of man, to be shown to the world by the Slavs headed by Russia.[39] Father Zosima in *The Brothers Karamazov,* in more moderate vein, expressed Dostoevsky's faith in the Russian people. "The salvation of Rus' comes from the people… The people will meet the atheist and overcome him, and Rus' will be unified and Orthodox".[40] Belief in God, for Zosima as for Shatov, and probably for Dostoevsky as well, can be a consequence of belief in the Russian people.

> Whoever does not believe in God [says Zosima] will also not believe in God's people. But whoever has come to believe in God's people, will also behold His sacredness, though he had not believed in it until then.[41]

This position was taken up by Russian nationalist Orthodox Christians in the 1970s (see Chapter 7).

Dostoevsky claimed that the Russian people were characterized by great humility and the ability and even desire to undergo suffering. This suffering gave them the ability to forgive themselves for their sins. The theme of redemption through suffering is particularly strong in *The Brothers Karamazov*.[42]

Dostoevsky firmly linked the destiny of Russia with Orthodoxy.

> Isn't there in it [Orthodoxy] alone both the truth *(pravda)* and the salvation of the Russian people, and in future centuries of the whole of humanity? Isn't there preserved in Orthodoxy alone the divine image of Christ in all its purity? And, perhaps, the most important pre-ordained assignment of the Russian people in the destinies of all humanity consists in preserving in itself this divine form of Christ in all its purity, and when the time comes, revealing this form to the world which has lost its way![43]

Dostoevsky followed Khomiakov in emphasizing the Orthodox traditions of the Russian people, rather than the Orthodox Church structures,[44] and in his praise of the *obshchina* for containing the seeds of a new future ideal.[45]

Berdiaev thought that Dostoevsky's Russian messianism was incompatible with his view of the humility of the Russians.

> [Dostoevsky] looked on the Russian people as the humblest on earth, but he was proud of this humility. And that, indeed, seems to be the pride of the Russians. Dostoievsky saw his people as the 'God-bearers', unique among their kind, and consciousness of this particularistic messianism is not compatible with humility; the feeling and mentality of the Jews of old were reborn in them.[46]

There was no humility in Dostoevsky's attitude to the aspirations of the national minorities of the Russian Empire, or to the Slavs outside the Empire. "The master of the Russian land is solely the Russian alone (Great Russian, Ukrainian *[maloruss],* Belorussian—it's all the same)." As for the Tatars, "There is not a square inch of Tatar land" in Russia; they were "aliens" on the Russian land.[47] In the *Diary* for June 1876, with the risings in the Balkans, Dostoevsky proclaimed that Russia was the "leader of Orthodoxy", destined to unite "all Slavdom, so to speak, under the Russian wing". For this, "Constantinople…must be ours."[48]

Dostoevsky insisted that Russia was motivated by the desire to serve, and not by the desire for glory or riches. "We will begin, now that the time has come, precisely by being servants to all, for the sake of universal pacification." The Slavs would be united, not in order to merge them with Russia, but to allow them to be regenerated. Dostoevsky realized that Europeans reading these lines would think he was interested only in annexation, but this was a misunderstanding. Russia's whole policy throughout the Petersburg period had been one of disinterestedness and service, not the pursuit of her own profit.[49] The Russian people were fully aware of the mission of Russia and the Tsar among the Slavs.[50]

Dostoevsky's belief in the Russian people was accompanied by a fear of the Jews. Not only in Russia, but in the West as well, he claimed to see Jewish finance capital pulling the strings of foreign policy and conspiring against Russia. The Rothschild family and the British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli were

particular targets. "And surely the truth is that the Yid *[zhid]* has again begun to rule everywhere, and has not only 'begun to rule', but never even stopped ruling?"[51]

The *Diary* for March 1877 contains a chapter called "The Jewish Question". Here Dostoevsky responded to contemporary accusations that he was anti-Semitic. He denied that he had any hatred towards the Jews. He defended his use of the term "Yid" on the grounds that he did not think it was abusive (although by that time the term "Jew" *[evrei]* was normally used and "Yid" was considered offensive). He also stated that he used it to refer to a particular "idea", by which he meant the rule of the kulaks and bankers.[52] It might be added that Dostoevsky's "Yiddish idea" is very similar to Marx's use of *Judentum* in his "On the Jewish Question". *Judentum* was frequently used at the time (1843) to mean not only Judaism but also commerce. Thus Marx wrote: "Money is the jealous god of Israel, beside which no other god may exist… The *social* emancipation of the Jew is the *emancipation of society from Judentum*".[53] David Goldstein sees Dostoevsky's identification of a nationality with capitalist and kulak exploitation as "an irrevocable verdict against the Jews".[54]

Dostoevsky's chapter goes on to claim that the Jews in Russia exaggerate their suffering; the Russian peasant is as oppressed as the Jew. Further, the dislike of the Russian for the Jew, where it exists,

> arises not at all from the fact that he is a Jew, not from any sort of racial or religious hatred, but it arises from other reasons where the guilt lies not with the native people but with the Jew himself.[55]

This is what anyone in the Russian borderlands would say about the Jews: "They have been moved for so many centuries only by pitilessness towards us and only by the thirst for our sweat and blood".[56]

The Jews were more prejudiced against Russians than the Russians were against Jews. The Jews looked forward to world domination; this required them to maintain their own close-knit identity. If they were given equal legal rights, but allowed to keep their "State within a State", they would be more privileged than the Russians. The consequences of this situation were already clear in Europe.

> Thus it is not for nothing that everywhere there the Jews are reigning *(tsariat)* over the stock exchanges, not for nothing that they control capital, not for nothing that they are masters of credit, and not for nothing, I repeat, that they are the masters of all international politics, and what will be in the future is known also to the Jews themselves: their reign is approaching, their complete reign![57]

Dostoevsky nevertheless declared himself in favour of "full and final equalization of rights", but then hedged this with the qualification "insofar as the

Jewish people themselves will show their ability to accept and exercise these rights without detriment to the native population".[58]

In his letters and notebooks, Dostoevsky claimed to see the Jews behind the socialist movement, in both Europe and Russia.

> The Yid and his bank are now reigning over everything: over Europe, education, civilization, socialism—especially socialism, for he will use it to uproot Christianity and destroy its civilization. And when nothing but anarchy remains, the Yid will be in command of everything. For while he goes about preaching socialism, he will stick together with his own, and after all the riches of Europe will have been wasted, the Yid's bank will still be there. The Antichrist will come and stand over the anarchy.[59]

Goldstein suggests that Dostoevsky's anti-Semitism came from the incompatibility of his claims for the Russian people with the Jewish claim to be the chosen people.[60]

Dostoevsky's opinion of the Jews did not rob him of the acclaim from both Westernizers and Slavophils that greeted his "Pushkin speech" of June 1880.[61] Pushkin's "transformation of his own spirit into the spirit of other peoples" reflected the ability of the Russian people, benefiting from Peter's turn to the West, to accept the cultures of other nations "without racial discrimination", and to enter "the all-embracing pan-human reunification with all the races of the great Aryan family".[62] (This presumably excluded the Jews.) Dostoevsky went on to make what is probably the classic statement of Russian universalist messianism, which deserves to be quoted at length.

> Yes, the Russian's destiny is incontestably pan-European and universal. To become a true Russian, to become completely Russian, perhaps means only (in the last analysis, underline this) to become a brother to all people, a *universal person,* if you like. Oh, all this Slavophilism and Westernism of ours is a great misunderstanding with us, although historically inevitable. For a true Russian, Europe and the fate of the whole great Aryan race are as dear as even Russia herself, as her native land, because her fate is universality, acquired not by the sword but by the force of brotherhood and our brotherly striving for the reunification of people… Oh, the peoples of Europe have no idea how dear they are to us! And later, I believe that we, that is of course not we but the future Russians, will understand to a person that to become a true Russian will mean precisely this: to strive finally to bring reconciliation to the European contradictions, to show the way out of European despair in our own Russian soul, pan-human and all-uniting, to embrace in it with brotherly love all our brothers, and finally, perhaps, to utter the final word of great, general harmony, of the final brotherly accord of all races according to Christ's Gospel law.[63]

As several commentators have noted, this is a considerably more moderate statement of messianism than those of Shatov or the *Diary* of 1876 and 1877. Dostoevsky is talking not about the "God-bearing people" or the seizure of Constantinople, but about Russia's role in the reconciliation of the peoples.[64] When Dostoevsky's speech was delivered in Moscow, it was received with rapture, since by combining the themes of the uniqueness of Russia and love for Europe, it appeared to offer something to both Westernizers and Slavophils. The Westernizer Turgenev embraced him, and the Slavophil Ivan Aksakov declared the speech a "historic event". Some of the enthusiasm proved to be ephemeral, with Turgenev and Koshelyov both attacking the idea of universalism, while Aksakov accepted it completely. In content, if not in rhetoric, the speech differed little from the *pochvennichestvo* of the early 1860s; Dostoevsky did not mention the Church, even though this played a central role in *The Brothers Karamazov*.[65] It might be appropriate to make the connection between the novel's idea of the mutual responsibility of people for each other's sins and Dostoevsky's view of Russia's responsibilities in Europe and the rest of the world.

The religious theme is re-emphasized in the last issue of the *Diary,* for January 1881. Here Dostoevsky advocates "our Russian socialism": not a programme to raise the living standards of the masses, but the aspiration to create a universal, ecumenical Church on earth. This, he claims, is the "thirst" in the Russian people. "Not in communism, not in mechanical forms is the socialism of the Russian people expressed." He re-affirms the faith of the Russian people in the Tsar.[66]

In the final section of the issue, however, Dostoevsky proposed a new orientation for Russia. Prompted by General Mikhail D.Skobelev's massacre of the Turkmen at Geok-Tepe, Dostoevsky called for the expansion of Russian power in Asia: "[T]he Russian is not only a European but also an Asian. Moreover, in Asia, perhaps, our hopes are still larger than in Europe. In our future destinies, perhaps Asia is our main end!"[67] It would appear that the conquest of Asia had replaced the liberation of the Slavs as the means of Russia's spiritual regeneration. "In Europe we were Tatars, but in Asia even we are Europeans. The mission *(missiia),* our civilizing mission in Asia will bribe our spirit and attract us there, as soon as the movement begins.[68]

In spite of the use of the phrase "civilizing mission", it is clear that Dostoevsky is talking of conquest and not universal "brotherly love".[69] (It is interesting to note that Engels also favoured a "civilizing mission" for Russia in Asia. He wrote in 1851: "Russia on the other hand is really progressive in relation to the East. For all its baseness and Slavonic dirt, Russian domination is civilizing on the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea and Central Asia and among the Bashkirs and Tatars". In 1888 Engels predicted that, after the overthrow of tsarism, "the noble nation of the Great Russians…will accomplish its genuine civilizing mission in Asia".[70])

Thus, at the end of his life, in the last issue of the *Diary,* Dostoevsky managed to combine the call for a brotherly universal church with the call for the expansion of the tsarist Russian State, to the benefit (or at the expense) of Asia.

This highlights the essentially contradictory nature of his thought, the one constant theme of which (at least from 1860) was his belief in the unique characteristics and role of the Russian people.

Alexander III, Nicholas II and the Jews

Dostoevsky's anti-Semitism regrettably found reflection in government policy after his death. Alexander III (1881–94) and Nicholas II (1894–1917), following the advice of Pobedonostsev, sought to strengthen their rule by promoting Great-Russian chauvinism, Russification and emphasizing the allegedly Orthodox nature of the State. In 1881, after some terrorists of the *Narodnaia volia* (People's Will) organization assassinated Alexander II, sections of the aristocracy and police stirred up the masses against the Jews. A series of pogroms occurred in the Ukraine and Southern Russia, usually with the acquiescence of the local authorities. Under Nicholas II, the legal position of the Jews deteriorated further, and police repression increased. From 1903, stories were published about a supposed Jewish plot to take over the world, including the fabricated *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Encouraged by large-scale anti-Jewish propaganda, a pogrom took place against the Jews of Kishinyov in 1903. This was followed by a series of pogroms in major centres during the Revolution of 1905. A key role in the latter was played by the "Union of the Russian People" or "Black Hundreds". Nicholas showed his support for the pogroms by taking membership in this organization. Some Orthodox clergy also joined the Black Hundreds and encouraged the pogroms.[71]

Leontev

Any discussion of the evolution of Slavophilism must mention the thought of Konstantin N.Leontev (1831–91). He claimed to be a Slavophil, in the cultural sense, and moreover one "closer to the aims of Khomiakov and Danilevsky than the semi-liberal Slavophils of the immobile Aksakov type".[72] Leontev certainly emphasized the moral strength of Orthodoxy and the decline of the West. The Slavophils of his time, however, rejected his claim to be one of them, considering him a reactionary. Ivan Aksakov held that Leontev was preaching the "lascivious cult of the truncheon".[73]

Leontev's writings make clear that in politics his "Slavophilism" was derived from Danilevsky, and he rejected classical Slavophilism as a disguise for egalitarianism and liberalism. Leontev believed that these two diseases were destroying Europe and threatening Russia. Against them, Leontev wanted to strengthen the spiritual discipline which he believed Russia had inherited from Byzantium, and the despotic Asiatic elements he admired in Russia. He had no time for the nationalism of the Slavs, seeing their national aspirations as part of a cosmopolitan revolution and harmful to the old order, which he wished to freeze. Instead, his book *Byzantium and Slavdom* (1875) predicted that the Danilevskian

"cultural type" which Russia would create would be "neo-Byzantine" rather than Slavonic. His opposition to nationalism included opposition to Russian nationalism; he opposed the Russification of the Baltic and Poland, and defended the privileges of the German and Polish gentry. He considered that the Habsburg and Ottoman empires should continue ruling the Slavs until Russia was ready to take them over.[74]

Leontev believed that in the long run, Russia had a global mission, deriving from her possession of the moral force of Byzantine Orthodoxy. She would have to save Europe from herself, by "uniting the Chinese state model with Indian religiousness, and subordinating European socialism to them".[75] Whether this position can be considered a form of Russian messianism is dubious. His deep pessimism, authoritarianism and belief in social privilege place him in opposition to those messianists who saw freedom as one of the gifts which Russia would bring to the world. By the end of his life, Leontev came to the conclusion that some form of socialism was inevitable; he looked forward to this being organized, in opposition to atheist socialism, by a Russian Tsar, a socialist Gonstantine. Only this Byzantine "powerful monarchical government" would be able to settle the "apparently insoluble modern task of *reconciling capital and labour*".[76]

Fyodorov

I turn now to two thinkers who developed their own philosophies of Russian messianism in the late nineteenth century and who were highly influential in later Russian thought. Both Nikolai F.Fyodorov (1828–1903) and Vladimir Solovyov believed that Russia, headed by the Tsar, had been chosen to bring about world unity. Fyodorov, a librarian at the Rumiantsev Museum in Moscow, published little in his lifetime, but after his death his disciples released in a small edition his *magnum opus,* "The Philosophy of the Common Task".[77] In this work, written mainly in the 1890s, he strongly supported Orthodoxy and autocracy, seeing them as unifying influences. He attacked capitalism for its division of humanity into rich and poor, learned and ignorant, and town and country, and for its militarism. He criticized Britain, in particular, for reducing the rest of the world to the status of unskilled workers.[78] He opposed socialism also, not only, like Dostoevsky, for its association with atheism, but because the socialist movement aggravated the division of humanity by fostering the hatred of the poor for the rich. He bemoaned the advance of socialism. "Socialism is triumphing over the State, religion and science…socialism is deceit."[79]

Fyodorov believed in the unlimited possibility of human progress, and sought to hasten this. Humanity could be united in the "common task": the regulation of nature, particularly the weather, and the conquest of space. The ultimate aim was to bring about, by human scientific advance, the resurrection of the dead. "The duty of resurrection, the duty to the fathers, the filial duty, as one can call it, appeared in the world together with man." [80] It fell to Russia to organize this

unity, because of her Orthodoxy and autocracy, and because of the existence of the *obshchina,* which he idealized. Additionally, Russia's geographical position, between Europe and Asia and near Africa, and the Russian tradition of "the gathering of the lands" would facilitate Russia's task. The Russian State was also favoured with a tradition of service and self-sacrifice, especially in relation to Western Europe.[81]

Fyodorov planned to convert the British Empire to Orthodoxy and autocracy as the first step towards unity. Thereafter, he suggested that a joint Russo-British expedition be sent to the Pamir Mountains to discover the remains of the earliest humans, the ancestors of humanity. The remains would then be transferred to the Moscow Kremlin. This would symbolize the role of Moscow as the "Third Rome" (and disavow the Petersburg tradition). Another symbol would be the perennial dream of Russian messianists, the capture of Constantinople.[82] World unity should be achieved, if at all possible, by persuasion; but if this proved impossible, Russia would have to use armed force. Unity would be political, linguistic and religious; the basis of society would be the *obshchina*.[83]

In the Soviet period, Fyodorov's belief in the limitless powers of humanity was purged of its association with Orthodoxy and autocracy, and linked with atheism and the belief in the future united the Communist world. Konstantin Tsiolkovsky, whose ideas laid the basis for the Soviet space programme, knew Fyodorov personally.[84] According to Nina Tumarkin's hypothesis, the intention behind the embalming of Lenin after his death was of resurrecting his body at some time in the future.[85]

Vladimir Solovyov

Vladimir Sergeevich Solovyov (1853–1900) has long been recognized as one of the major Russian Christian philosophers. Discussions of his ideas divide his life up into three periods. In his younger years he was close to the Slavophils. Then he moved away from them, denouncing their Russian nationalism, and also leaning from Orthodoxy towards Catholicism. In this second period he developed his "theocratic utopia", the idea of the unity of humanity through the unity of Christianity, under the spiritual leadership of the Pope and the political leadership of the Russian Tsar. The role of Russia in this unity represented a new development in Russian messianism. Towards the end of his life he realized the impracticality of his plans, and became concerned in this last period with what he saw as the threat to Christian civilization from the East.

As a young man, Solovyov's view of Russia's role was developed not in relation to Catholicism and Protestantism, as in the Slavophils, but in relation to the West and the Muslim East. His major article of 1877, "Three Forces", marked his closest approach to Slavophilism.[86] It spoke of the Orthodox Slav, and especially Russian, mission to reconcile the Muslim East, with its despotic unity and acceptance of an "inhuman God", and the West, which aspired to individual egoism and its product, economic socialism, with its "Godless

human". The mission involved humanizing God and turning people towards God; the Russians had to mediate between the divine world and humanity, through divine revelation, and were suited to this task by their religiosity and lack of exclusiveness. Like Ivan Aksakov and Dostoevsky, he believed that the war against Turkey would raise the Russian people to their mission. For Solovyov, the Russian conquest of Constantinople was linked directly not only with the reconciliation of East and West, but with reconciliation between God and humanity. This trend was taken further in his "Lectures on God-humanity" (*Bogo-chelovechestvo,* also translated as "Divino-humanity", "God-manhood"; 1877–81). Here, Western and Eastern Christianity are "absolutely necessary for each other and for the spread of Christ's teaching throughout all humanity".[87]

By the early 1880s Solovyov's desire to reconcile the Christian churches became linked with the belief, which had attracted Chaadaev fifty years before, that Catholicism was superior to Orthodoxy. The Catholicization of Russia would overcome what Solovyov saw as the religious root cause of the divisions in Slavdom, both outside Russia, and, in the case of Poland, within the Empire.[88] Although Solovyov never became a Catholic, in the late 1880s he was willing to accept Papal supremacy. He attributed to the Russian Tsar a divine role in the reunification of Christianity on the basis of Catholicism. In *La Russie et l'église universelle* (1889), published in France, Solovyov wrote: "the historical task of Russia consists in supplying the church universal with political might, which is necessary to it in order to save and regenerate Europe".[89] Russia's contribution to Christianity, then, was primarily her coercive power. The Tsar was to obey the wishes of the Pope, thereby creating the conditions for a universal theocracy and the regeneration of Christianity. Russia, said Solovyov, would "be free to fulfil its great universal vocation, to unite around itself the Slavic nations and found a new truly Christian civilization".[90]

Solovyov, who always defended the Jews against persecution, accused the Slavophils of subordinating Christianity to their idealization of the Russian people. As he wrote in 1891:

> The sin of Slavophilism was not that it ascribed to Russia a higher vocation, but that it insufficiently insisted on the moral conditions of this vocation…let them proclaim still more decisively the Russian people as the gathering Messiah, so long as they remember that the Messiah must also act like a Messiah, and not like Barabbas.[91]

The unreality of Solovyov's plans for universal unity became clear to their author. The last period of his life, from about 1891, represented his disillusionment with the possibility of world theocracy. He had found interest from Roman Catholics but none from the Tsar or Russian society. In political terms, he became still more hostile to the Russian conservatives, accusing them of imitating Chinese ancestor-worship in their cult of the past. The consequence

of this would be to weaken Russia and lay her open to conquest from Asia. He became obsessed with the "yellow peril":

> O Russia! …Which is the East you desire to be:
> The East of Xerxes or of Christ?

he had written in "**Ex** oriente lux" in 1890. His poem "Pan-Mongolism" of 1894, accusing Russia of deluding itself that it was the Third Rome, saw a Chinese conquest of Russia as the end of history. This is taken further in his "Three Conversations" of 1899. Cast in prophetic terms, this described the conquest of Europe by the combined forces of Asia, the appearance of Antichrist in Europe, and the unity of the Christian churches as a prelude to the millennium and the resurrection of the dead.[92]

Vekhi

Solovyov's influence was very strong in the movement of Russian intellectuals, from the *fin de siècle* to 1917 and beyond, towards religion and mysticism. But different aspects of his thought appealed to different people. The Symbolist poets were attracted to his mysticism, while rejecting his Christianity; the philosophers were attracted to his Christian idealism and liberalism.[93] The exMarxists who had evolved towards liberalism found his critiques of positivism and materialism helpful in their criticism of the revolutionary intelligentsia. This group achieved its greatest political impact with the publication in 1909 of *Vekhi (Landmarks),* "A Collection of Articles on the Russian Intelligentsia".[94] The inclusion of *Vekhi* in this chapter is justified, because some at least of its contributors were heavily influenced by the Slavophils, *pochvenniki* and Solovyov.

Berdiaev, perhaps the most anti-regime of the contributors, wrote that the cultural renaissance of Russia demanded "not only political liberation, but also liberation from the oppressive rule of politics". He added: "Political liberation is possible only in connection with, and on the basis of, spiritual and cultural renaissance". His attack on the Russian intelligentsia for its atheism and materialism echoed the Slavophils and *pochvenniki,* but he put part of the blame for the condition of the intelligentsia on Russian history, the political system and "our eternal reaction".[95] Another contributor who took a similar position was Sergei N.Bulgakov, a "Christian socialist".[96]

Within *Vekhi,* it was only Berdiaev and Bulgakov who put forward a special role for Russia in world history. Berdiaev suggested that while truth could only be universal, not national, different nationalities were called on to disclose different aspects of the truth. Russia's vocation was in the sphere of religious philosophy. He saw Russian philosophy as beginning with Khomiakov, who surpassed European rationalism, and developing in Solovyov.[97] Bulgakov accused the intelligentsia of "cosmopolitanism", and of failing to think through the "national problem". The intelligentsia was indifferent to the "national idea",

to "religiocultural messianism" and to the defence of nationality. Bulgakov said that "the greatest exponents of our national self-consciousness—Dostoevsky, the Slavophils, Vladimir Solovyov" linked the national idea with the world tasks of the Russian Church or Russian culture. The failure of the intelligentsia to do this was giving a monopoly of patriotism to "militant, chauvinist nationalism".[98]

Berdiaev understood that the apocalyptic events of the First World War would put an end to European dominance of world culture. During the war he wrote:

> The end of Europe will see the appearance of Russia as a [the?] determining spiritual force on the arena of world history…Russia, occupying the place of a mediator between the East and West, and being itself "East and West", has been called to play a great role in uniting humanity. The World War brings us to the problem of Russian messianism.[99]

Berdiaev's expectations of Russia's role appeared to be confirmed by the October Revolution.

This chapter has shown some of the ways in which Slavophilism developed after the early Slavophils. There could be no return to the traditions of Muscovy in nineteenth-century Russia, and to remain viable Slavophil messianism, originally rooted in Orthodoxy, took on a geopolitical character. For Ivan Aksakov it meant pan-Slavism; for Dostoevsky, by the end of his life, it pointed towards Russian expansion both in the Slav lands and in Asia. Fyodorov and Solovyov both sought universal human unity, but through the Russian Tsar: Fyodorov aimed at the resurrection of the dead, while Solovyov went so far as to prefer Catholicism to Orthodoxy. Leontev had superficial similarities with Slavophilism but was a philosopher of order rather than of freedom.

4
Messianism and revolution
From Herzen to Stalin

In this chapter I shall consider the interaction of a native-based Russian socialism with Marxism, itself (I shall suggest) a messianic doctrine. The Bolshevik Revolution, drawing on Marxism and Russian messianism, could not live up to its universalist promise and developed, as will be seen, into a more nationalist form of messianism under Stalin.

From the 1840s, the Slavophil idea of the *obshchina* began to inspire the predecessors and founders of *narodniehestvo,* or Populism, with the thought that Russia could be a model for the world, by avoiding the evils of capitalism and creating socialism on the basis of the peasant commune. The *obshchina* was important in the thought of Bakunin, Herzen, N.G.Chernyshevsky, P.L.Lavrov and N.K. Mikhailovsky.[1] The term *narodnik* has the connotations both of responsibility to, and belief in, the people.

Herzen

Aleksandr Ivanovich Herzen (1812–70) has been described as "the founding father of Populism".[2] He united the Slavophil view that Russia should develop on the basis of the *obshchina* with the secularism and commitment to individual freedom that characterized the Westernizers. Having been arrested in 1834 for participation in a Saint-Simonist circle, he returned from exile to Moscow in 1842. While he disliked the anti-Westernism of the Slavophils, he knew and admired them as individuals, particularly Ivan Kireevsky, and he sympathized with their patriotism. Anticipating Dostoevsky, he wrote in 1843 of the Russians fusing the best attributes of the European nations, and perhaps being called on to unite theory and practice for the benefit of humanity. It was almost certainly as a result of Slavophil influence that Herzen later took the idea that the *obshchina* was of central importance in Russia's future. Already in 1843 he described the communal principle and the lack of a proletariat as "excellent seed buds" for Russia's development. But Herzen thought that the Slavophils forgot that even within the *obshchina,* the peasant had no possibility of self-respect, existing in conditions of oppression and serfdom. Nevertheless, it was "not without foundation", wrote Herzen in 1844, that the Slavophils believed in the

"enormous future of the Slavs" and their ability to solve Europe's problems.[3] But the question was still open as to whether the Slavs, via the *obshchina,* would lead the West to socialism, or whether the West would lead the Slavs there.[4] From 1844, his belief that the *obshchina* constrained individual freedom encouraged him to look more to the upheavals in the West.[5] He emigrated to Europe just before the 1848 revolutions, but the triumph of the bourgeoisie led to his disillusionment with the West and a renewed concentration on Russia.

From April 1849, he began to emphasize the virtues of the *obshchina,* and spoke of an "internal force" which sustained the Russian people against the Mongols and the Petersburg bureaucracy.[6] However, he still hoped that revolution might succeed in France. In his letter to Jules Michelet, "Le peuple russe et le socialisme" (1851), he claimed that the *obshchina* was the only authority respected by the peasants and the source of their morality. Russian peasants very rarely cheated each other because they were protected from the corruption around them by the *obshchina*. "The commune has preserved the Russian people from Mongol barbarism, from civilizing tsarism, from the Europeanized landowners and from the German bureaucracy… It has fortunately been preserved up to the development of socialism in Europe." He was not asserting Russian superiority; he was claiming equality with Europe for Russia. He was stating that Russia might be approaching socialism from a direction different from that of Europe, but was no closer to it than Europe.[7]

Marxist messianism

In this section, I shall discuss the elements of messianism which were present in Marxism before its penetration into Russia. In 1844, in the "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right", Marx argued that the German proletariat could not free itself from its exploitation and suffering without emancipating the whole of society. It could "redeem itself only through the *total redemption of humanity…Thorough* Germany cannot make a revolution unless it is a *thorough* one. The *emancipation of the German* is the *emancipation of the human*".[8] This tendency to identify German interests with the needs of world socialism recurred throughout the lives of Marx and Engels.

The idea of the proletariat as the universal class is central to classical Marxism. It was reformulated, without being restricted to Germany, by Engels in the Preface to the 1888 English edition of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party:*

> the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions and class struggles.[9]

In abolishing private property, the proletariat overcomes the division of society into classes and restores the communist form of society, which allegedly existed in primitive times; but the new Golden Age is at an incomparably higher level of culture and technology. For Marxism, the proletariat is the Messiah, the class which suffers and then redeems humanity. The German Jewish philosopher Walter Benjamin saw Marx's proletariat as "the last enslaved class, as the avenger that completes the task of liberation".[10]

The need for the international unity of the proletariat is a central theme of the *Manifesto*. "United action, of the civilized countries at least, is one of the first conditions of its emancipation." Nevertheless, "The Communists turn their main attention to Germany." This was justified on the grounds that the forthcoming bourgeois revolution would be "immediately" followed by a proletarian one, because of the strength of the German proletariat.[11] The apocalyptic atmosphere of the period found its justification in the revolutions of 1848. Engels, however, found himself in June of that year not arguing for international workers' unity, but applying the Hegelian concept of "historical" and "unhistorical" nations. He wrote in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* that the only possible outcome of the Prague uprising was a "war of annihilation" *(Vernichtungskrieg)* of the revolutionary Germans against the counter-revolutionary Czechs.[12] In January 1849, he declared:

> Amongst all the nations and nationalities of Austria there are only three bearers of progress, which have actively intervened in history and are still capable of independent life: Germans, Poles and Magyars. They are therefore revolutionary now.
>
> All the other great and small nationalities and peoples have the mission to perish in the revolutionary world storm. They are therefore now counterrevolutionary.[13]

It is difficult to avoid accusing Marx and Engels of tending to lapse into German nationalist messianism. Horace B.Davis suggests that they "may indeed have both been unconscious, or subconscious, nationalists in that they hoped Germany would take the lead in establishing socialism".[14] On the other hand Solomon F.Bloom states, "Marx simply was not a nationalist".[15] Engels decisively rejected the allegations of German nationalism levelled at the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung,* pointing out that the journal had always supported Polish independence. He added, "hatred of the Russians was, and still is the *first revolutionary passion* of the Germans".[16] In private, Marx and Engels were still more proGerman. Marx wrote to Engels in 1870, during the Franco-Prussian War in which they publicly opposed the German seizure of Alsace-Lorraine: "the French need a thrashing. This [German] predominance on the world stage over the French would also mean the predominance of *our* theory over Proudhon's etc".[17] Engels wrote in an article of 1892 that the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) would have

to defend the nation against an attack by Tsarist Russia, and fight the French Republic if France were allied with tsarism.[18]

It appears safe to conclude that the founders of scientific socialism believed in the special vocation of the German people in general and of the German proletariat in particular. This was combined with hostility to the Slavs and especially to Tsarist Russia. Marx and Engels in their later life nevertheless took a keen interest in the Russian revolutionary movement.

Marxism in Russia

The *narodnichestvo* of the 1860s and 1870s was created, in a sense, out of Marxism: Russian socialists were aware of Marx's critique of capitalism and wished to avoid the miseries of capitalist industrialization. Marx himself gave some justification to the narodnik approach, in a letter of 1877, in which he explicitly stated that his description of capitalism in Western Europe could not have universal validity.[19] In his letter to the narodnik Vera Zasulich of 8 March 1881, he described the *obshchina* as the "mainspring of Russia's social regeneration", but stated that it could not function unless the forces hostile to it were removed.[20] In the introduction to the 1882 Russian edition of the *Manifesto,* Marx and Engels made the survival of the *obshchina* into the future communist society conditional on proletarian revolution in the West.[21]

If *narodnichestvo* was created out of Marxism, then Russian Marxism in the 1880s was created out of *narodnichestvo*. Georgy V Plekhanov, a leading narodnik, believed that capitalism was inevitable in Russia but bitterly opposed the Jacobinism of narodniks such as Nechaev (the model for Dostoevsky's *Devils*) and P.S.Tkachev. They favoured the building of a revolutionary elite to seize power. This led Plekhanov to break with Populism and establish the first Russian Marxist group in 1883. But Russian revolutionary Marxists did not believe that Russia would follow exactly the same path as Western Europe. Plekhanov said in 1889 that the Russian revolution would be victorious only as a workers' revolution. In this context, the appearance of Trotsky's theory of Permanent Revolution, under the impact of the 1905 Revolution, does not seem surprising.

At the end of 1904, Trotsky's friend Parvus (A.L.Helfand), a Russian-Jewish Marxist based in Germany, predicted, "The Russian revolution will shake the bourgeois world… And the Russian proletariat may well play the role of vanguard of the social revolution".[22] In June 1905 Trotsky wrote that the Russian working class would be "the initiator of the liquidation of world capitalism".[23] His book *Results and Prospects* (1906) argued that the Russian bourgeoisie was so weak and cowardly that the Russian proletariat would have to carry out the task of the bourgeois revolution itself. It would not stop there, but would have to begin the socialist transformation of Russia, and in order to stay in power, would have to spread the revolution outside Russia as well.[24]

Commentators have noted the possible influence of Jewish messianism on the ideas of Jewish participants, such as Trotsky, in the Russian revolutionary movement. Young Jews played a major role in the main narodnik circles in the 1870s and 1880s.[25] Moshe Mishkinsky suggests that Jewish workers in late nineteenth-century Russia were receptive to socialism because of their religious background. "The Jewish labor organizations received socialist doctrine as revelation, as a messianic vision which had been nourished to some extent by Jewish eschatological traditions and universal ideas of redemption."[26] Sergei Bulgakov saw a similar connection. He wrote in 1905 that "atheistic socialism" had the same "earthly" ideals as Jewish messianism, and counterposed both to his "Christian socialism".[27] In 1910 he depicted socialism as a "transposition of Jewish chiliasm", in which the proletariat were the "chosen people".[28]

While the influence of Jewish messianism may have had a role in attracting Jews to Marxism, there is little doubt that the influence of *narodnichestvo* added a dimension of Russian messianism, and probably Jewish messianism, too, to Russian Marxism. The eschatological mentality penetrated Bolshevism, with the "God-building" movement led by Anatoly V.Lunacharsky talking about constructing the messianic kingdom on earth.[29] Lunacharsky, comparing the proletariat with Christ, wrote: "the new Messiah climbs Golgotha, its blood flows, it is nailed to the cross".[30] Already in 1906 Berdiaev was finding a "religious thirst and an eschatological hope" in Russian Marxism.[31] In *Vekhi* he went further. In Russia, he said, Marxism had become a cover for the traditional narodnik "cliquishness" of the intelligentsia. Thus the intelligentsia was not interested in whether a theory was true, but only in whether it served the people or proletariat. In particular, the Russian Marxists had an "exceptional belief" in the possibility of achieving socialist objectives in Russia earlier than in the West.[32]

The October Revolution and Russian messianism

The group which most fully represented socialist Russian messianism in 1917 was the Left Socialist Revolutionaries (SRs). For this party of romantic revolutionaries, Russia's suffering in the war was akin to the Crucifixion, and the October Revolution represented redemption. Russia was the instrument for the creation of a New World. Providing the Bolsheviks with a valuable bridge to the peasantry, the Left SRs joined the Council of People's Commissars (Sovnarkom) in November 1917, and proved particularly enthusiastic in the security police (Cheka). Lenin's argument that Russia should not undergo a period of liberal democracy but could lead the rest of Europe to the socialist revolution appeared to them an implicit acceptance of the narodnik position. The adoption of the SR land policy by the Bolsheviks made the link explicit. For the Left SRs, however, there could be no compromise with the Old World; therefore, when Lenin realized the necessity of an armistice with Germany and signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in March 1918, they saw this as a betrayal of the world revolution. Not

only did they leave the Sovnarkom but they used terrorist methods to try to provoke a revolutionary war with Germany.

The poets known as the "Scythians", grouped around R.V.Ivanov-Razumnik, the literary editor of SR and then Left SR periodicals, provided a graphic illustration of the messianic revolutionary mood. Sergei Esenin called Russia "the new Nazareth"; Nikolai Kliuev compared Lenin to the Old Believer leader Avvakum. The symbolists, Aleksandr Blok and Andrei Bely, had absorbed Vladimir Solovyov's eschatology and had been expecting a cosmic struggle against Antichrist. Bely's poem "Rodine" ("To the Motherland") of August 1917 addressed Russia as the "Messiah of the Coming Day".[33] His poem "Khristos voskrese" ("Christ is Risen") was written in 1918, after the October Revolution. Blok's "Dvenadtsat'" ("The Twelve", January 1918), depicted Jesus at the head of a troop of Red Guards. It was not accidental that Trotsky called this poem "the most significant work of our epoch".[34] In his "Skify" ("Scythians"), written during the Brest-Litovsk negotiations, and addressed to Europe, Blok portrayed the Russian people as barbarians. If Europe failed to join the revolution, the Russians would cease to perform their historic mission of protecting Europe from the Asian hordes, and would allow European civilization to be crushed by the yellow peril.[35]

The influence of Russian messianism on Bolshevism itself is much less clear. Consciously, Lenin, Trotsky and the leading Bolsheviks were Marxists, seeking to promote an international working-class revolution which had started in Russia but which would be completed in Europe. Nevertheless, they admitted certain narodnik influences. In particular, commentators have widely remarked on the impact on Lenin of Tkachev and Nechaev, both of whom Lenin admired. The centralized, conspiratorial organization, and the subordination of the individual and all morality to the needs of the revolution, were taken by Lenin from these two figures. Such ideas, however, were rejected by many narodniks, and they had no necessary connection with Russian messianism, being linked more with Jacobinism.

Bolshevism did appear as a manifestation of Russian messianism in the belief in Russia as a model for East and West. The English, American and French revolutions all produced people who wished their revolutions to be extended to the rest of the world. With Bolshevism this was the dominant theme: the workers of Europe, and the workers and peasants of the colonial world, should themselves overthrow capitalism and imperialism. The Communist or Third International (Comintern) was established to facilitate this. But, as with the earlier revolutions, there were times when it was considered expedient to spread the Revolution by force.

The removal of the capital from Petrograd, under threat of German invasion, back to Moscow symbolized a turning-back from the Petersburg period. Already in 1917, before the October coup, the Orthodox Church had restored the Patriarchate, not in the then capital Petrograd, but in Moscow, "the Third

Rome". Lenin and Trotsky strengthened the symbolism by choosing to live, like the Muscovite Tsars, in the Kremlin.

Between 1918 and 1920 the Bolsheviks had to fight a civil war against the Whites, who sought to regain their power and property. The Whites had the backing of fourteen foreign powers, trying, as Winston Churchill proposed, to strangle the Bolshevik infant in its cradle. In addition to appealing to workers and peasants in West and East, the Bolsheviks sought to mobilize Russian patriotism in their support, first against the Germans and then in the course of the Civil War. On 21 February 1918, the Sovnarkom issued a proclamation signed by Lenin, declaring: "The socialist fatherland *(otechestuo)* is in danger! Long live the socialist fatherland!"[36] The foreign intervention led many forces in Russian society to support the Bolsheviks, seeing them as more authentically national than the Whites. The former Tsarist commander General A.A.Brusilov and other tsarist military leaders issued an appeal to Russians to support the Bolsheviks in order to defend Russia.[37]

In October 1920, after the defeat of the Whites, the Kadet (liberal) Nikolai V Ustrialov proclaimed himself an adherent of "National Bolshevism". The anti-Bolshevik groups, he said, were too closely tainted by foreign links. Soviet power, on the other hand, was a "national factor of contemporary Russian life"; its interests coincided with Russia's State interests, and Bolshevism would "evolve from Jacobinism to Napoleonism".[38] The term "National Bolshevism" seems to have been coined by the Bolshevik Karl Radek to describe the policy of some German Communists who attempted to unite with right-wing German nationalists against the Entente.[39]

In 1924, after the death of Lenin, Stalin, as General Secretary of the Communist Party, proclaimed the policy of "Socialism in one country". From Stalin's viewpoint, the adoption of this represented recognition that the USSR would have to rely on her own resources to build socialism without the direct help of the West European proletariat. It followed from the position Lenin held in his 1918 "Theses on Peace": now that a socialist government was victorious, it was necessary to decide questions from the viewpoint of strengthening the revolution in Russia, rather than gambling on its spread elsewhere.[40] From the viewpoint of the ordinary Party member, and perhaps the ordinary worker, it allowed a sense of national pride in the belief that Russia was to be the first country to construct socialism. It was a step in the direction of *narodnichestvo*. From Trotsky's viewpoint, it meant "a mortal blow to the International".[41] Isaac Deutscher spoke of two "quasi-Messianic beliefs" opposing each other: "Trotskyism with its faith in the revolutionary vocation of the proletariat of the West; and Stalinism with its glorification of Russia's socialist destiny".[42] Trotsky could claim that Stalin's doctrine appealed to those who were tired of revolutionary upheavals; Stalin could accuse Trotsky's followers of lacking faith in Russia. In the mid- and late 1920s, Stalin surreptitiously encouraged the view that the Trotskyite and Zinovievite opposition was a "Jewish mutiny", and this

seems to have been believed by many workers.[43] Trotsky accused Stalin of "Messianic nationalism", of seeking to build what he called "national socialism".[44]

Berdiaev's view of Russian Communism

The principal advocate of the interpretation of the Russian revolution in terms of Russian messianism was Berdiaev. His attitude to the Russian people was complex. In "The New Middle Ages" (1923–4), he spoke of the universalism of the Russians, in terms reminiscent of Dostoevsky.

> The Russian people, of all the peoples in the world, is the most pan-human and universal in its spirit; this belongs to the structure of its national spirit. And the calling of the Russian people must be the task of world unification, the formation of a single Christian spiritual cosmos.[45]

He held this idea throughout his life, repeating in *The Russian Idea* (1946) that the "Messianic consciousness is more characteristic of the Russians than any other people except the Jews".[46]

For Berdiaev, as for the Slavophils, socialism resulted from capitalism and both resulted from humanity's falling away from God. As Bulgakov had in 1905, he linked socialism with Jewish chiliasm, since both desired a paradise on this earth.[47] Berdiaev, like Bulgakov, saw Marxism as a religious faith, a secularized form of Jewish messianism. Marx's proletariat was not the real working class but an object of faith, like his socialist society. The coming catastrophe of capitalism replaced the Last Judgement, the proletariat was the chosen people and the communist society replaced the Kingdom of God on Earth.[48] Socialism was in principle opposed to democracy; democratic socialism was not true socialism. Under socialism, power was wielded by a minority which claimed to represent the proletariat, and not by the proletariat itself. Socialism represented unity in Antichrist. Again like Bulgakov, Berdiaev was prepared to call himself a Christian socialist, but emphasized that this was not true socialism. His conception of socialism, then, was of an atheist, vanguard dictatorship. The Russians were not capable, said Berdiaev, of creating a liberal democracy. "Khomiakov and K.Leontev, Dostoevsky and L.Tolstoy, Vladimir Solovyov and N.Fyodorov subvert the bourgeois system and spirit no less than Russian revolutionaries, socialists and Communists. Such is the Russian Idea."[49] The revolution had produced an extreme anti-humanist socialism. "The Russian people, as an apocalyptic people, cannot create a middle-of-the-road humanist realm; it can create either a brotherhood in Christ or a comradeship in Antichrist."[50]

In *The Russian Idea,* Berdiaev produced a survey which emphasized the more extreme aspects of Russian thought, climaxing in the Soviet period. The same dogmatism and self-sacrifice that was present in the religious schismatics appeared in the Russian intelligentsia, and Berdiaev saw all the Russian

revolutionaries as unconscious chiliasts, expecting the Kingdom of God on Earth. The messianic consciousness was present in the "Third Rome" concept and in the Third International. Just as the messianism of the Third Rome degenerated into imperialism, so was the messianic idea present in Russian Communism, but distorted by the will to power. The Godlessness of the October Revolution came not only from Bolshevik attitudes but because the Orthodox Church served tsarism. In 1917, Berdiaev said, Marxism was Russified and merged with Russian messianism.[51]

Russian identity under Lenin and Stalin

Before and after 1917, Lenin believed in the need for the unity of workers of all nationalities against capitalism and imperialism. As socialism and communism were built around the world, he expected that nationalities would go through a process of coming together *(sblizhenie)* and ultimately fusing *(sliianie)*. In power, he was increasingly worried about the growth of Great Russian nationalism, which he viewed as provoking minority nationalism; and he became converted to the idea of federalism, to allow autonomy to the non-Russian nationalities in the territories where they were concentrated. In practice, however, the Constitution of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR), adopted in 1918, contained no specifically federal arrangements. The use of the geographical "Rossiiskaia" rather than the ethnic "Russkaia" for "Russian" signified, however, that the State was to represent not only the Russian nationality but all the peoples of Russia.

After the Bolshevik conquest of the Caucasus was completed in 1921, Stalin, as People's Commissar for Nationalities, proposed incorporating it into the RSFSR. Lenin objected to this, and proposed instead the formation of a "Union of Soviet Republics of Europe and Asia". As a result, in December 1922 all four soviet republics—the RSFSR, Ukraine, Belorussia and Transcaucasia (Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia)—united in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). The USSR was, potentially, the universal state, not limited by ethnicity or geography. The Communist Party remained centralized and key decisions were taken in Moscow. The federal structures of the Soviet state and the creation of republic organizations of the Communist Party allowed the process of nativization *(korenizatsiia)*: the promotion of cadres from the local nationality, the use and development of the local language, and the growth of local loyalties.[52]

The year 1934 marked a clear change. Party leaders for the first time openly began to express and encourage Russian nationalist feeling. The Press began to talk about the importance of loving the fatherland. Such a form of Soviet patriotism, on its own, was not necessarily Russian nationalism; but it was followed in subsequent years by the rehabilitation of Russia's pre-revolutionary past. This was not the "national pride" that Lenin had taken in the peasant revolts or the Decembrists, but the exaltation of Russian military heroes, be they

Muscovite tsars or generals such as Kutuzov and Suvorov. By 1938, many national schools had omitted Russian from the curriculum; in that year, it was made compulsory.[53] It would appear that the regime was seeking to build a political base among the Great Russian population, as the dominant nation, in order to hold the Soviet Union together as it faced the threat of invasion.

In terms of its effect on the Russians, the appeal to Russian nationalism must be considered a success during the Great Patriotic War (1941–5). In September 1941 Stalin admitted to Averell Harriman, the American Ambassador, that the Russian people were not fighting for the Party. "We are under no illusion that they are fighting for us. They are fighting for Mother Russia."[54] From the Lenin Mausoleum in Red Square, Stalin addressed the troops bound for the front on the anniversary of the revolution, 7 November 1941: "Let the manly images of our great ancestors—Alexander Nevsky, Dimitry Donskoy, Kuzma Minin, Dimitry Pozharsky, Alexander Suvorov, and Mikhail Kutuzov—inspire you in this war!"[55] This invocation of tsarist Russian heroes could appeal to Russians, and to many Ukrainians and Belorussians, but not to the other nationalities. The dissolution of the Comintern in May 1943 was highly symbolic, but perhaps not as significant as it is sometimes considered to be, for most non-ruling Communist parties continued for the time being to be loyal to Moscow. The new anthem of the Soviet Union which replaced the Internationale in 1943 stated that the USSR had been created by "Great Rus'". Alongside Russian patriotism, however, there remained an attempt to appeal to the non-Russians through their own traditions, as well as the more orthodox Soviet patriotism.

Stalin's "victory toast" of 24 May 1945 made clear that the Russians were to be seen as the core of the USSR. It was both an attempt to carry over into peacetime the support that he, a Georgian, had won from the Russians during the War, and a signal to the non-Russians.

> I would like to propose a toast to our Soviet people, and in particular to the health of the Russian people.
>
> I drink first of all to the health of the Russian people because it is the leading nation of all the nations belonging to the Soviet Union.
>
> I propose a toast to the health of the Russian people because it earned in this war general recognition as the guiding force of the Soviet Union among all the peoples of our country.
>
> I propose a toast to the health of the Russian people not only because it is the leading people, but also because it has a clear mind, a firm character and patience.[56]

The tremendous losses and sacrifices made in the War by the Soviet population, above all by the Russian, Ukrainian, Belorussian and of course Jewish peoples, had a major impact on the feelings of the masses. One of the themes of Russian messianism now taken up by official Soviet propaganda was Russia's military services to humanity. Russia had saved Europe from the Mongols, from

Napoleon and now from the Nazis—a view which reflected Russian popular sentiment.[57] Along with this universalist messianism—Russia as servant—came a nationalist messianism, trumpeted from official platforms. The creativity of the Russians was praised to unheard-of heights. Russia owed nothing to the West, but led the world in everything. A.A.Zhdanov, the ideology Secretary of the Central Committee, claimed in 1946: "Our literature, reflecting a system many times superior to any bourgeois democratic order, a culture many times higher than any bourgeois culture, has the right to teach other people a new, universal, human morality".[58] The virulent attack on Western culture, characterized as bourgeois cosmopolitanism, continued until the death of Stalin. It developed into an anti-Semitic purge, as "cosmopolitan" became code for "Jewish". It peaked in January 1953 when Jewish doctors were accused of plotting to kill Stalin. The charges were dismissed after Stalin died two months later.

The Russian Orthodox Church and Russian messianism under Lenin and Stalin

Even before 1917, Lenin's strong antipathy to any form of religion took a particularly hostile form as far as the Russian Orthodox Church was concerned, because of the links of the latter with the tsarist State. After October 1917, large numbers of hierarchs and priests were arrested, and many believers were killed. The Patriarch of Moscow, Tikhon, was arrested in 1922. In July 1923, having been released, he published a "confession", in which he stated that he had been involved in "anti-Soviet activities" of which he now repented. The Church leaders continued to suffer arrests and exile. The regime sought to pressurize successive leaders of the Patriarchate to carry out its wishes. Tikhon died in 1925. In March 1927, the Patriarchal *locum tenens,* Metropolitan Sergii of Nizhny Novgorod, was released from prison. The following summer he made a declaration of loyalty to the Soviet government. He asked for the position of the Church to be normalized, and for a Sobor to be held to elect a Patriarch. Following this declaration, Sergii was allowed to take over the administration of the Church. The respite proved temporary; the 1929 Law on Religious Associations removed the legal right of religious propaganda, confining the churches to the role of worship. From 1929 to the mid-1930s all the religions in the Soviet Union, including the Orthodox, suffered severe persecution.

When the Nazis attacked in June 1941, Metropolitan Sergii responded at once with a call on Christians to take an active part in the war, emphasizing that the fates of the Orthodox Church and the Russian nation had always been linked. The Church collected millions of roubles for national defence, equipping the Dimitry Donskoi tank column and the Alexander Nevsky air squadron. In September 1943 Stalin and the Foreign Minister, V.M.Molotov, received Sergii and two other metropolitans in the Kremlin and promised to improve conditions for the Church. A Sobor of hierarchs was held and elected Sergii as Patriarch of Moscow. At the same time, thousands of Orthodox churches were re-opened

throughout the country. Other faiths also had their position improved and regularized; the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists (AUCECB) was established for the Protestant groups, and four Spiritual Directorates were created for the Muslims.[59]

Within the context of the new religious freedom, the Orthodox Church was given a privileged position. Whereas the other faiths were administered by the Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults, it was governed by the Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church. Following the death of Patriarch Sergii, a Sobor was held in January-February 1945 to elect Metropolitan Aleksii of Leningrad as Patriarch. A graphic example of the State's partiality to the Orthodox Church was the forced incorporation of the Ukrainian Uniate (Greek Catholic) Church into the Russian Church.

The then dissident Russian Orthodox priest Gleb Pavlovich Iakunin (born 1934) wrote in 1976 a critical samizdat account of the activities of the Patriarchate under Stalin. He is right to see Stalin's support for Orthodoxy as part of his move to a "nationalist-chauvinist policy", in which the Church was given the role of a "catalyst and cementing component".[60] The Russian Orthodox Church was the traditional church of not only the Russians but also of most Ukrainians and Belorussians, covering the three largest nationalities in the USSR. In return for Stalin's support, the Church heaped the highest praise on him, using language normally reserved for Jesus. Stalin was "the first man of peace", with an "all-embracing heart which takes on itself all the pain of suffering".[61] It was he "whom Divine Providence chose and placed to lead our Fatherland on the path of prosperity and glory".[62] Iakunin suggests that Aleksii expected that Stalin was about to declare the country a pan-Slav Orthodox Empire.[63] It may not be too fanciful to speculate that Stalin's inclination towards the Orthodox Church was linked with his own training as an Orthodox seminarian.

The presentation of Stalin as "God's chosen one" was a direct descendant of Filofei's portrayal of the Tsar. This concept was extended to the messianic presentation of Moscow as the "chosen city", the "Third Rome". The occasion was the 800th anniversary, in 1947, of the founding of the city. Archpriest N.A. Khariuzov, for example, combining Orthodox and Communist ideas, wrote in the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate:*

> Now Moscow is the centre of the social life of humanity, the centre which unites all progressive and democratic elements, and in religious life Moscow is not the centre of aristocratically despotic Catholicism or of anarchic Protestantism. Moscow is the centre of true Orthodoxy, rejecting this or that extreme.
>
> It is not only among us Russian people that the thought of Moscow awakens the best memories of our native country, but also among the peoples of the fraternal republics, among all the Slavs, and among all the freedom-loving peoples the thought of Moscow evokes the best, bright hopes for the future…

> Moscow is a beacon, a beacon not only for us Orthodox, but also for those seeking true, unclouded civil, national and religious freedom. Moscow is a beacon for all of toiling humanity, for all who seek religious and social truth.[64]

In November 1947 the Metropolitan of the Levant, Elie Karam, visited Patriarch Aleksii. In a speech he portrayed the Russian people as the chosen people.

> I have found out a lot about the great Russian people and its Church and am now personally convinced that the Russian Orthodox Church is the *greatest* Church of Orthodoxy… The Lord God blesses the Russian people as He once blessed Abraham. The Russian people is like the people of the Holy Land and the Russian land can be compared with the Holy Land of Palestine.[65]

More directly, the Bulgarian Metropolitan Stefan said in 1948: "Moscow became the Third Rome by occupying the place of the First in its confession of Christ's truth".[66]

The last two quotations exemplify the use of the Russian Orthodox Church in promoting Soviet foreign policy. Part of the price paid by the Church for its relatively privileged position in the USSR was the obligation to promote among foreign churches, and later in ecumenical church bodies, official Soviet views, as well as denying the existence of any religious persecution. The Russian Church was not successful in its attempt to take over the role of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Orthodoxy, the Patriarch of Constantinople, but, owing to the Soviet military control of Eastern Europe, it was able to establish itself as the "elder brother" of the Orthodox churches in the Balkans, and hence promote Soviet interests through churches in Bulgaria, Romania and Yugoslavia.[67]

Stalinism and Russian messianism: an appraisal

The internationalism and universalist messianism of the October Revolution gave way to "Socialism in one country", initially an attempt to allow the revolution to survive in a hostile capitalist world. "Socialism in one country" developed, however, into a policy of making Russia into something resembling a normal member of the international system (reflected in the Soviet entry into the League of Nations in 1934), unwilling unduly to alienate capitalist allies abroad. Revolution was soft-pedalled or repressed in the Popular Front period (especially during the Spanish Civil War), and even the ideological struggle with Nazism was abandoned during the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact (1939–41).

The Great Patriotic War itself gave a colossal boost to Russian messianist feeling at the mass level. The famine during the Siege of Leningrad, the slaughter and heroism at the Battle of Stalingrad, the cruelty of the Nazis, the loss of loved ones all provided symbols of suffering which fed into what can be

described as the collective consciousness. At the same time, the knowledge that the Soviet Union had played the major role in the defeat of Germany produced the messianic perception of redemption through suffering.

After the War, the division of the world into superpower spheres of influence left ambiguous the Soviet attitude to revolution in the West (shown in Stalin's unwillingness to aid the Greek Communists). The imposition of the Soviet model on the East European countries and their subordination to Moscow to some extent can be represented as a result of nationalist messianism, although the immediate rationale was to create a buffer zone.

It would be wrong, however, to suggest that Russian culture was privileged under Stalin; many of its creators died in the camps. The Russian Orthodox Church, seen under Lenin as particularly counter-revolutionary, came back under Stalin in a privileged position and did what the Communist Party could not: it proclaimed that Moscow was the Third Rome and that Stalin was chosen by God.

This chapter has surveyed socialist Russian messianism from Herzen and the narodniks to Stalin. There might seem to be little in common between the messianism based on the agrarian *obshchina* and the extension of the power of the newly-industrialized USSR into Prague and Berlin. But the Populist belief that Russia could have a special road to socialism fed into Russian Marxism and then Bolshevism. Lenin's version of Marxist class messianism, defying the laws of economics and denying the rule of law, led to the dictatorship of the Party and then to Stalin's totalitarian system.[68]

Class and nationality are both human constructs, but for most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries nationality has been a stronger loyalty. Accordingly, regimes based on class messianism are likely to tend to shift towards national messianism. This is as true for China, Cuba and Yugoslavia as it was for Russia. The isolation of the revolution in Russia meant that it would either collapse, or survive "in one country". This made a certain appeal to national feeling inevitable. The founders of scientific socialism had already shown in the nineteenth century how easy it was to combine their doctrine with nationalist messianism—in their case, the German variety. Stalin, in power in a Russia faced with capitalist encirclement, replaced the German ingredient with the Russian equivalent.

5
De-Stalinization and the growth of Russian national consciousness
The Khrushchev era

N.S.Khrushchev, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) from 1953 to 1964, attempted to reform the Communist system to make life easier for Soviet citizens. In Stalin's last years a form of Russian messianism had become integrated into official thinking. Khrushchev did not renounce the idea of the Russian people as the elder brother of the other peoples of the USSR, but he did end the extreme Russian chauvinism which characterized the final period of the rule of his predecessor. While Russian national consciousness under Stalin was tightly controlled, Khrushchev's de-Stalinization process, heralded by his "secret speech" denouncing the dictator at the **XX** Party Congress in 1956, allowed the appearance of some autonomous manifestations. The ending of Stalin's terror produced the "Thaw" in Russian culture, and in the non-Russian republics gave confidence to the local ethnic political and cultural elites.

Literature and Russian national consciousness: early village prose, Solzhenitsyn and *Novyi mir*

In the 1950s, the new genre of literature which contributed most to the development of Russian national consciousness, and then of Russian nationalism, was that known as *derevenskaia proza*—village, or rural, prose. This began with a concern for the problems of the countryside, and particularly the desire to protect the peasants from the exploitation which they suffered on the collective farm *(kolkhoz)*. It developed into a literature which advocated the protection of peasant morality and customs, the villages themselves, and the churches and other historical monuments of Russian culture. It became linked with the defence of the Russian natural environment against the predacity of technological progress. The practitioners of *derevenskaia proza* became known by the rather condescending term of *derevenshchiki,* which was acoustically close to a word denoting rural idiocy *(derevenshchina)*. They themselves preferred the name *pochvenniki,* making the link with Dostoevsky's ideas. Some of them went so far as to give a positive portrayal of the peasants' traditional Russian Orthodox Christianity.

A writer who was to become prominent in the Russian nationalist movement came to notice with the publication of his "Vladimir Country Roads" in *Novyi mir* (New World) in September and October 1957. *Novyi mir* was a monthly literary journal of the USSR Union of Writers. Vladimir Alekseevich Soloukhin was born in 1924 to a peasant family in the village of Olepino in Vladimir *oblast',* and these sketches depict his return in 1956 to his native region. This theme of the rediscovery by a town dweller of his village roots was common among the *derevenshchiki* of the 1950s and 1960s. Soloukhin showed enthusiasm for marshes and meadows. He depicted the peasants' problems but expressed admiration for their customs, their folk art and their churches. Vladimir *oblast',* as Soloukhin himself has said, is "the very heart of Russia",[1] including the ancient cities of Vladimir and Suzdal, which formed the core of the Russian State prior to the dominance of Moscow. It was from Vladimir *oblast'* that Vladimir Osipov was to edit the samizdat journal *Veche*. Soloukhin's essays "Dewdrops" (1962) and his novel "Coltsfoot" (1964) continued his preoccupation with the countryside.[2] As Leonid Pliushch points out, this concern for Russian culture did not prevent him from taking part in the denunciation of Boris Pasternak in 1958 after he was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature.[3]

Sergei Pavlovich Zalygin (born 1913) turned only relatively late in his literary life to the problems of the village, with his story "On the Irtysh" published in *Novyi mir* in February 1964. Set in Siberia, where Zalygin had lived most of his life, it told of the injustices perpetrated during the collectivization of agriculture. It showed the resistance of the peasants, and the unnecessarily brutal way in which collectivization had been implemented. This was one of a number of works published in *Novyi mir,* up to September 1965, which were critical of Stalin's peasant policy.[4]

It was Aleksandr Isaevich Solzhenitsyn, born in Kislovodsk in 1918, who had the greatest impact on the development of Russian national feeling, both in the Khrushchev period and under Brezhnev. His stories *A Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* and "Matryona's House", published in *Novyi mir* in November 1962 and January 1963, respectively, presented his view of the Russian peasant in specific real Soviet contexts.[5] "Matryona's House" portrays the appalling poverty of a Russian village in 1953. Moreover, it takes further than any other of the works of village prose the idea of the old peasant woman as the repository of traditional moral values, in a rural world corrupted by the needs of Soviet industrialization. Matryona's spirit of self-sacrifice holds her village together, and she, like the author, is motivated by Christianity. According to Grigory Pomerants, writing in samizdat, "for a million people Christianity began with reading 'Matryona's House'".[6] This figure of the old Orthodox peasant woman was to recur in later village prose, most notably as Valentin Rasputin's Daria in "Farewell to Matyora" (see p. 75).

As a political statement, *Ivan Denisovich* was of incomparably greater significance than any of the other stories cited here. The illiterate peasant Shukhov shows his shrewdness in his successful struggle to survive in the

Stalinist prison camp. The Christian element here is only marginal: Shukhov believes in God, but does not expect any good from Him.[7] Solzhenitsyn himself was not one of those who had his faith in Marxism shattered in 1956. He had gone to the camps as a Marxist-Leninist, and argued there that Stalin had distorted Lenin. But through his sufferings in prison he changed his convictions and before the XX Congress had become an Orthodox Christian.[8]

In 1957, in reaction to the liberalism of *Novyi mir* and of the Moscow Writers' Organization (and to the Hungarian uprising), the Party leadership established the Union of Writers of the RSFSR. This was headed by Leonid S. Sobolev, described by Michael Glenny as a "hard-line Stalinist", and it was intended to weaken the influence of the liberal Moscow writers. The journals *Oktiabr'* and *Nash sovremennik (Our Contemporary),* previously published by the USSR Writers' Union, were handed over to it. As it was specifically the union of the writers of the Russian Republic, it is perhaps not surprising that it became the major literary centre not only of conservatism (as was the intention) but also of Russian nationalism.[9]

The contribution of village prose, and of the work of Solzhenitsyn, to the development of Russian nationalism in the Khrushchev period was that it presented a source of values, based on the Russian village and Russian Orthodoxy, which began to provide an alternative to the values of Marxism-Leninism, now becoming discredited. This process was to go further in the Brezhnev era.

Unofficial political activity

The more relaxed political atmosphere allowed the appearance of unofficial cultural and political circles among the Moscow intelligentsia. I confine myself here to two men who were to play a role in promoting Russian messianism under Brezhnev. Vladimir Nikolaevich Osipov, the future editor of the samizdat journal *Veche,* was born in 1937 in Chizhikovo village in Pskov *oblast'*. He became a history student at Moscow University. His fervent belief in Stalin was shattered by Khrushchev's "secret speech". Osipov's fate became linked with Anatoly Mikhailovich Ivanov, who used the pseudonyms Novogodny and later A. Skuratov. Ivanov-Skuratov (as I shall refer to him throughout), born 1934, studied history with Osipov but was arrested in 1959 for participation in a "circle". He was sent to a prison psychiatric hospital but freed in 1960. Osipov himself was expelled from university and the Komsomol in 1959 after publicly defending Ivanov-Skuratov. The two came together in 1960 in a political "club" which sought to rally the healthy forces of the CPSU to liquidate the consequences of Stalinism, and create a society on the Yugoslav model. They also took part in meetings on Maiakovsky Square, which brought on them the ire of the authorities. In October 1961 they were arrested. Osipov was given a seven-year labour camp sentence, while Ivanov-Skuratov was given another spell in a prison psychiatric hospital.[10]

The anti-religious campaign and the Russian Orthodox Church

In July 1954 a Central Committee resolution attacked the success of the Russian Orthodox Church in winning over young people and called for the intensification of anti-religious propaganda.[11] Four months later, however, another resolution criticized counter-productive methods used in the struggle against religion.[12] It was not until 1959 that a massive anti-religious campaign began, led by Khrushchev and the head of the Central Committee Propaganda Department, L.F.Ilichev.[13] According to Anatoly Emmanuilovich Levitin-Krasnov, who was active in fighting persecution then,

> 1959 to 1964 was a very fearful time. The Soviet State with all its powerful apparatus, with the whole army of Chekists and secret informers, with all its innumerable staff of propagandists, journalists and correspondents, struck against the Church. We were isolated from everyone in this. It seemed as if the Church in Russia was doomed. The Patriarchate took a manifestly collaborationist position.[14]

There is little doubt that the anti-religious campaign was linked with Khrushchev's Utopian desire and promise to build communism in the USSR by 1980. There were also fears that the Party was aiming at achieving Lenin's aim of the fusion *(sliianie)* of nationalities (which had been downplayed under Stalin), with talk of abandoning the ethnically-based Union Republics for a unitary state. Such a "melting-pot" policy threatened nationally-minded Russians and non-Russians alike. Religion and ethnicity were closely linked in the Soviet Union. Khrushchev's anti-religious campaign was also linked with deStalinization. While de-Stalinization in other fields meant a relaxation and liberalization, in relation to religion it meant an end to the *détente* that had developed under Stalin with the major churches.

The Russian Orthodox Church suffered from the campaign in the same way as other churches. Levitin-Krasnov's view that the Moscow Patriarchate collaborated with the anti-religious campaign is shared by other writers of Orthodox samizdat in the Khrushchev and Brezhnev periods. These include Boris V Talantov (1901–71) from Kirov *oblast',* and the Moscow priests who wrote to Patriarch Aleksii in 1965, lakunin (see p. 58) and Nikolai I.Eshliman.[15] Nevertheless, Patriarch Aleksii does appear to have put up resistance to the campaign on occasion. In February 1960 he argued that the Russian Church had played a major role in the consolidation and defence of the Russian State through the centuries. Similar themes regularly appeared in *The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*. In May 1963 he intervened to defend the rights of the monks of the Pochaev Monastery in the Ukraine.[16] The main cause for complaint, however, and a turning point in the development of Russian Orthodoxy, was the Sobor of bishops of 18 July 1961, held in Zagorsk, Here the Patriarch steam-rollered the

bishops into accepting a number of changes in the organization of the Church. The most important was that the priest lost all power over the parish and was transformed into a wage labourer, responsible to an executive committee of three parishioners, headed by the churchwarden. Subsequent experience was to show that the authorities would use the new arrangements to discredit priests and close down churches in an offensive against the Church involving the Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church and local Soviets. It appears that Aleksii, the metropolitans and many of the bishops were resigned to this situation. Similar measures were introduced for other religions.[17]

Eshliman and lakunin reckoned that 10,000 Orthodox parish churches were closed in this period, representing one half of all those functioning in 1958. Other estimates suggest an even greater proportion. The number of monasteries and convents was reduced by four-fifths between the mid-1950s and mid-1960s. The number of parish priests was reduced by about half. These figures conceal an unknown amount of intimidation, physical ill-treatment, beatings, imprisonment in mental hospitals, rape and murder of priests and believers. The evidence for this brutality is in samizdat accounts. These documents sometimes emphasized the link between Orthodoxy and Russian patriotism.[18] Others accused the authorities of abandoning Lenin's ideas and following Stalin's policy of persecution, despite the talk of de-Stalinization.[19] Samizdat allegations could be denied by the authorities. What could not be concealed, and which even attracted criticism in the official press, was the wholesale destruction of churches. This often took place during the night to avoid opposition from the faithful. Thus, in July 1964 even the church of the Metropolitan of Moscow, the Cathedral of the Transfiguration, was destroyed by night.[20]

Cultural figures were active in the defence of churches and monasteries as historical monuments. *Literaturnaia gazeta* on 23 August 1956 carried a condemnation of the destruction of the Smolensk Cathedral in Ufa. This was signed by the writers Efim Dorosh, a *derevenshchik,* and Ilia Ehrenburg. *Izvestiia* called in 1962 for the preservation of church architectural monuments, and the liberal writer Viktor Nekrasov complained in *Novyi mir* (November 1962) about the destruction of churches and icons. Ordinary believers appealed for the preservation of religious objects as historical monuments.[21] Such pleas were rejected. On 10 May 1962 *Pravda* criticized an article in *Moskva* which had objected to the continuing destruction of monasteries and churches in the capital.[22] Khrushchev refused to listen to an appeal on the subject by Sergei Mikhalkov, the author of the words of the Soviet State anthem.[23] Solzhenitsyn, too, understood the importance of churches as monuments to Russian culture. In 1958–9, after cycling around central Russia, he wrote his "Miniatures". This included 'Along the Oka", which described the churches as the source of the beauty of the Russian countryside.[24] In August 1963 he visited Kuiikovo Field, and found the ruined medieval church of St Sergei of Radonezh. The iconostasis had been chopped up for firewood.[25]

It appears that the anti-religious campaign and the destruction of churches provoked a feeling that the churches should be defended, a feeling which spread well beyond religious believers to many people concerned with Russian history and Russian culture. The revival of Russian national consciousness, expressed particularly by the *derevenshchiki,* faced a challenge in the anti-religious campaign, from which it emerged strengthened. In 1964 Andrei Tarkovsky began his film about the icon painter and monk *Andrei Rublev*. Completed in 1966, the film was not then shown in the USSR, but it attested to growing interest in Russia's religious past. Also in 1964 the VSKhSON was established with a Russian Orthodox nationalist ideology (see Chapter 7). In October Khrushchev was overthrown. While it would be wrong to see the reasons for his fall in the anti-religious campaign or the destruction of churches, his retirement was swiftly followed by an official repudiation of the methods of the campaign[26] and the establishment of organizations to protect Russian historical monuments. Despite Khrushchev's desire to create a nationless, atheist Soviet land, the national minorities and the Russians knew more about their cultures and were more nationally-conscious in 1964 than they had been in 1953. The basis was laid for the development of a Russian nationalist movement, outside the control of the Party.

6
The Brezhnev era
Cultural Russian nationalism

During the Brezhnev era (1964–82), the political leadership generally showed considerably more sympathy to Russian traditions and Russian interests than Khrushchev had. The top leaders and the central Party apparatus were divided among themselves as to how much leeway should be given to Russian national feeling. The abandonment by General Secretary Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and Prime Minister Aleksei Nikolaevich Kosygin of Khrushchev's Utopian aim of achieving communism by 1980, together with the shift towards managerialism and pragmatism, deepened the ideological confusion that had been created by Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin. Some leaders saw the answer in the satisfaction of material demands; others wished to rehabilitate Stalin; others wanted to promote more traditional forms of Russian nationalism. The 1960s and 1970s saw a rise in both Russian and non-Russian nationalism.

Positive discrimination in favour of the indigenous nationalities of the republics outside the RSFSR in admission to higher education and to the republican elites—a result of de-Stalinization—led to grievances among Russians. Within the RSFSR, the feeling of Russians that the economic interests of Russia were being sacrificed to the development of other Union Republics was fed by official propaganda that this was indeed the case. The Party Programme, adopted in 1961, had contained the sentence:

> Depending on mutual fraternal help, in the first place on the help of the great Russian people, all the Soviet national republics have created their own modern industry and national cadres of the working class and the intelligentsia, and have developed a culture which is national in form and socialist in content.[1]

Similar statements on the generosity of the Russian people were repeated throughout the Brezhnev period.

Moreover, the 1970 census showing the rapid growth of the traditionally Islamic nationalities and the stagnation of the Russians raised fears about the capacity of the latter to continue to dominate the Soviet Union. This was linked with fears about the moral degeneration of the Russian people. Alcoholism was on the

increase, and had led to declining male life expectancies. Corruption in everyday life was proliferating and was contributing to the spread of cynicism. A deep popular fear of China, fuelled by the Cultural Revolution and the 1969 border clashes, was encouraged by official attacks on Peking. This led people to question whether Russian youth was spiritually prepared for a possible war. The main impulse behind the growth of Russian nationalism under Brezhnev, then, seems to have been the desire to defend Russian interests, and the Russian people itself, against whatever was threatening it. By no means was it mainly an aggressive nationalism, a "great-power chauvinism", although such elements did appear and were particularly linked with anti-Semitism. This latter was encouraged by the official "anti-Zionism" campaign which followed Israel's victory over its Arab neighbours, several of whom were allied with the USSR, in the Six-Day War of June 1967.

Together with Russian nationalism went a growing interest in the Russian past, encouraged by part of the Russian cultural intelligentsia. It is difficult to disentangle cause and effect here; did Russians become interested in their national past because of their nationalism, or did an interest in icons and churches lead them on to Russian nationalism? Further, some of the figures involved seem to have been at least partly motivated by a sympathy for the traditional Russian national religion, Orthodoxy. Different people travelled in different directions and did not make all the connections; not every icon collector was a Christian or a Russian nationalist.

The Brezhnev era saw the development of the Russian nationalist movement and the re-emergence of Russian messianism. In this chapter, I shall consider some of the officially-permitted cultural manifestations of Russian nationalism and messianism, looking particularly at the literary journals, village prose and the anniversary of the Battle of Kulikovo. In the next chapter I shall look at the thought and activity of the unofficial Russian nationalist movement.

Cultural Russian nationalism, 1964±70: *Molodaia gvardiia* and its critics

Organizations were officially established in the 1960s under pressure from the Russian nationalists. Already at the October 1964 Central Committee Plenum where Khrushchev's overthrow had been approved, the question of the preservation of historical monuments had been raised. Then on 16 October 1964—within 24 hours of the fall of Khrushchev—the RSFSR Ministry of Culture issued an "Instruction on the bringing to light, registration and collection of works of old Russian art".[2] In that year the Komsomol organized the "Rodina" (Motherland) clubs for young people interested in the protection of monuments. The Leningrad artist Ilia Sergeevich Glazunov (born 1930) was reputed to be the leader. Leonid Pliushch has characterized his ideas as "Monarchy, Orthodoxy, truly Russian culture", slightly varying Uvarov's formula of the reign of Nicholas I.[3] The members of Rodina were known as *rusity* (Russites), and later

the term "Russkaia partiia" (Russian Party) was used for this tendency. In 1965 the government allowed the formation of the "All-Russian Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments" (VOOPIiK), under the auspices of the RSFSR Ministry of Culture. Similar societies had already been established in the three Transcaucasian republics under Khrushchev.[4]

The driving forces behind the formation of VOOPIiK were Glazunov and Soloukhin. The restoration of churches and monasteries has been a major part of its activity. By 1982 VOOPIiK had 14.7 million individual members.[5] According to Ianov, it was a forum where Russian nationalist dissidents and official cultural figures could mingle. Both here and in the Rodina Clubs, Jews were considered outsiders and viewed with hostility.[6] The socialist dissident Lev Z. Kopelev in 1974 called VOOPIiK "in essence a legal organization of new Black Hundreds".[7] Soloukhin's writings conveyed strong hints not only of Russian nationalism but also of Orthodox Christianity. His "Black Boards" (1969) condemned the destruction of churches and religious objects, under Khrushchev and Brezhnev too, and described the continuing power of Russian icons to attract people.[8] The "All-Russian Society for the Protection of Nature" (VOOP), in which Russian nationalists were also active, was reported to have had 19 million members in 1971.[9]

The journal *Voprosy literatury* hosted a discussion on "The Literary Criticism of the Early Slavophils" in 1969.[10] Four scholars took the traditional Leninist position that the Slavophils were Utopian or reactionary. The other seven were more favourable. In particular the critics Vadim V.Kozhinov and A.M.Ivanov praised the Slavophils for pointing to the uniqueness of the Russian people. Ivanov wrote:

> The chief factor which the Slavophils valued in the Russian people was not at all humility, but the communal [*obshchinnyi*] spirit, what we would now call the feeling of collectivism, as counterposed to the individualism and egoism of the bourgeois West. [11]

In the late 1970s collections of the works of the early Slavophils began to be published, together with sympathetic biographies.

Of wider interest was the attempt to claim Dostoevsky, traditionally viewed as reactionary in Soviet criticism, for the Soviet State. This reflected the growth of interest in the religious and philosophical thought of Dostoevsky which began in the 1960s and has not diminished. Glazunov praised Dostoevsky as an ally against cynicism and social atomization, and claimed that his critique of the bourgeois world was still relevant. Further, he quoted Dostoevsky's statement from the manifesto for *Vremia,* that the "Russian idea" was a synthesis of the best of Europe's ideas.[12] At a closed meeting of literary critics, held in Moscow on 25 April 1969, Anatoly P.Lanshchikov (born 1929) linked the revolution to Russian messianism. "Our country has a special road. Dostoevsky spoke of that. And that is precisely why the revolution was achieved in our country." To a

comment from the floor—"That's Berdiaev's conception"—Lanshchikov justified the relevance of Berdiaev. Returning to Dostoevsky, he proclaimed: "if the role of Orthodoxy is to be denied, then I don't know what there remains of Russia."[13] The flood of articles in connection with the 150th anniversary of Dostoevsky's birth in 1971 provided ample opportunities for debate over how much of the writer's ideas could be incorporated into the Soviet canon.[14]

An important source of support for village prose, for the movement to preserve historical monuments and for Russian nationalism in general was provided by the literary journal and the publishing house of the All-Union Komsomol, both called *Molodaia guardiia* (Young Guard). Soloukhin himself and the *derevenshchik* Iury Kazakov (1927–82) were on the editorial board of the journal, as was the Kirghiz writer who wrote about the traditions of his own people, Chingiz Aitmatov. Articles by Glazunov and Soloukhin in *Molodaia gvardiia* did much to popularize the conservation movement. Soloukhin's "Letters from the Russian Museum" in *Molodaia gvardiia* in 1966 complained of the neglect and destruction of Russian treasures and monuments—in particular, churches and monasteries. He emphasized their aesthetic, cultural and historical value and their importance in developing a national consciousness needed for a new society. He showed how Lenin himself had sought to preserve Russia's heritage.[15] The journal often included a section, "Cherish what is sacred to us" *("Beregite sviatyniu nashu")*.

In June 1967, in response to an attack by Igor Zolotussky in *Literaturnaia gazeta* the previous April, *Molodaia gvardiia* set forth what was in effect its political programme. This did not talk of proletarian internationalism, the construction of communism or socialist morality. Instead, it spoke of the journal's concern with educating youth with "respect for the people's history, for the native land, for the cultural legacy and for national *(natsional'nye)* values".[16] Around *Molodaia gvardiia* were gathered not only nationalists who defended the peasant past and sympathized with religion (best termed the *vozrozhdentsy,* or revivalists), such as the *derevenshchiki,* but also nationalists who, like the National Bolsheviks, believed in a strong Russian State (the *gosudarstvenniki),* and in some cases looked back to the good old days of Stalin. These two groups were sharply divided on questions ranging from the value of religion to the necessity for collectivization.

In 1968, during and after the Prague Spring, articles appeared in *Molodaia gvardiia* by the critics Mikhail P.Lobanov, an editorial board member, and Viktor P.Chalmaev, who until November 1966 had been deputy chief editor, and who already under Khrushchev had attacked Solzhenitsyn's work. The articles appealed to the "Russian spirit" against cosmopolitanism and Americanization.[17] The October Revolution was presented as a manifestation of this Russian spirit rather than a stage in the international class struggle. Chalmaev invoked Sergei Esenin, who he said counterposed "the cosmopolitan, soulless" civilization of America with the spirituality *[dukhovnost']* of Russia.[18] He favourably cited the arch-conservative Leontev (discussed in Chapter 3), and the *derevenshchik*

Fyodor Abramov.[19] Unlike the classical Slavophils, Chalmaev referred to the attachment to the State *(gosudarstvennost')* of the Russian people.[20] Lobanov (born 1925) recalled Dostoevsky's Stepan Verkhovensky from *The Devils,* and denounced liberalism in general. He spoke of the mortal struggle of "two irreconcilable forces—moral uniqueness [the Slavophils' *samobytnost'*] and the Americanism of the soul".[21] Chalmaev was supported by Lanshchikov.[22] The journal also published a poem by Feliks Chuev glorifying Stalin.[23]

In August 1970 an article "On Values, Relative and Eternal" by the historian Sergei N.Semanov, attempting to rehabilitate Stalin, appeared. It spoke of the "universal equality" brought after the adoption of the Stalin Constitution (in reality the time of the worst purges) and praised Stalin's appeal in 1941 to the memory of Tsarist war heroes.[24] Semanov, born in 1934 in Leningrad, had been appointed editor-in-chief of the series *Zhizn' zamechatel'nykh liudei (The Lives of Outstanding People),* published by the Molodaia gvardiia house, the previous year.[25] Other articles appeared, some supporting Stalin and attacking Trotsky;[26] others supported Russian nineteenth-century anti-socialist thinkers such as Strakhov (see Chapter 3);[27] others called more generally for more attention to be given to the Russian past.[28] Iury D.Ivanov criticized the foreign influences on the Decembrists and Pushkin.[29] Kozhinov described how the Russian people had saved the world three times, from Genghis Khan, Napoleon and Hitler. "We came out three times in history as a unique force, able to save all the other nations from a grandiose war machine which was striving to crush them." He spoke of Russia's "national and universal *[obshchechelovecheskoi]* mission".[30]

The First Secretary of the Moscow Writers' Organization, Feliks Kuznetsov, at the above-mentioned April 1969 meeting of critics, suggested that *Molodaia gvardiia* and *Nash sovremennik* formed a third pole in literature and politics. The first two were the liberal *Novyi mir* and the conservative *Oktiabr'*. This is helpful, if it is understood that the nationalist pole represented by *Molodaia gvardiia* and *Nash sovremennik* included both Stalinists, such as Semanov, and anti-Stalinists, such as Soloukhin and Valentin Rasputin (see below), who condemned the Stalinist attitude to historical monuments and the peasants. Kuznetsov spoke of the impossibility of combining Chalmaev's position with Marxism. He continued that Soviet misfortunes were "not from socialism but from not enough socialism, not from Europe but from not enough Europe".[31]

It was over Chalmaev's articles in *Molodaia gvardiia* that *Novyi mir* was to clash with the Stalinists. The deviations of *Molodaia gvardiia* from Leninist orthodoxy did not pass unnoticed. In February 1968 the USSR Writers' Union journal *Iunost' (Youth)* had accused *Molodaia gvardiia* of ignoring proletarian internationalism in its adoration of things Russian.[32] The magazine of the Union of Journalists, *Zhurnalist,* reported in May 1969 that Chalmaev had been censured by the Central Committee Propaganda Department.[33] In *Novyi mir,* A.G. Dementev wrote an article attacking Chalmaev's chauvinism and rejecting his claim that bourgeois cosmopolitanism posed a danger for Soviet society. "Chalmaev," wrote Dementev, "speaks in the language of Slavophil messianism

rather than in the language of our contemporaries."[34] This provoked an attack on *Novyi mir* in July 1969 by eleven writers of the Russian national orientation. It took the form of a letter to *Ogonek,* the then pro-nationalist mass-circulation journal of the USSR Writers' Union, whose editor-in-chief, Anatoly V.Sofronov, was close to Glazunov. It asserted that the Soviet Union was indeed threatened by corrupting influences from the West.[35] Aleksandr Ianov has claimed that Dementev's article, by uniting the old Stalinists with the new nationalists, sealed the fate of *Novyi* mir.[36] It is more likely that the sacking of some of the editorial board in February 1970 and the consequent resignation of Aleksandr Tvardovsky, the editor-in-chief, was connected with his struggle against Stalinism and for the publication of Solzhenitsyn's works.[37]

The ideological complexity of this period is shown by the position of Solzhenitsyn, who had achieved publication only thanks to *Novyi mir*. Solzhenitsyn found himself philosophically closer to Chalmaev, who had earlier attacked Solzhenitsyn's work, than to *Novyi mir,* for Chalmaev was defending religious inspiration as a historical source of Russian patriotism. Whereas *Molodaia gvardiia* had put up a defence of religion, *Novyi mir* had supported Khrushchev's anti-religious campaign. The editors of *Ogonek* and *Moskva* spoke more openly about the destruction caused by collectivization than Tvardovsky did. (But when Solzhenitsyn offered his work to *Ogonek* and to *Literaturnaia Rossiia,* the newspaper of the RSFSR Writers' Union, edited by supporters of the Russian orientation, they rejected it.)[38]

The nationalism and Stalinism of *Molodaia gvardiia* went too far for Brezhnev, lury Melentev, the director of the Molodaia gvardiia publishing house, was sacked from his post and from his membership of the CPSU Central Committee (after, according to Ianov, he had tried to persuade Brezhnev of the need for a 'patriotic' indoctrination campaign among the youth and a purge of cosmopolitanism). Nevertheless, Melentev was quickly made RSFSR Deputy Minister (and then Minister) of Culture, showing that he had powerful backers.[39]

Semanov's article "On Values, Relative and Eternal" provoked a vigorous response from the veteran Party member Raisa Lert, in the samizdat journal *Politicheskii dnevnik (Political Diary),* edited by the Marxist dissident Roy Medvedev. Her article "The Charms of the Knout" pointed out that while Semanov favoured the preservation of monuments, it was in fact Stalin who had carried out much of their destruction. Semanov cared nothing for the Russian people and Russian culture, but was an apologist for great-power chauvinism, tsarism and Stalinism.[40]

More seriously for Semanov, his article appears to have been the catalyst for the Politburo member and Central Committee Secretary responsible for ideology, M.A.Suslov, to initiate a meeting of either the Secretariat[41] or the Politburo[42] to discuss the nationalist challenge. Brezhnev reportedly spoke at this meeting, in November 1970, against the religious themes which were creeping into the Soviet media. It was decided to sack Anatoly Nikonov from the chief editorship of *Molodaia gvardiia*. Lobanov, Soloukhin and Proskurin were

allowed to remain on the editorial board, and in April 1972, A.S.Ivanov, who had been deputy chief editor since April 1969, was made chief editor. Chalmaev later joined the editorial board. After the "purge", though, Chalmaev no longer wrote about church bells; the journal had less village prose but more patriotic memoirs of such Great Patriotic War heroes as Marshal Chuikov which emphasized Soviet rather than Russian patriotic themes.

Who was backing the Russian nationalists? It seems likely that the senior patron was the Politburo member and First Deputy Prime Minister, D.S. Poliansky, who, although apparently Ukrainian, has been identified as an extreme Russian nationalist. The neo-Stalinist Politburo member and head of the trade unions A.N.Shelepin probably also gave support. The Cultural Department of the Central Committee, headed by V.F.Shauro, a Belorussian, was strongly supporting the nationalists.[43] According to the former Soviet writer Georgy Vladimov, M.S.Solomentsev, in 1970 a Central Committee Secretary, was also a nationalist supporter. Michael Rywkin records rumours that Solomentsev and I.V.Kapitonov, another Central Committee Secretary, were behind the nationalists. These two were the only representatives of the top leadership to attend a Kremlin celebration of the Kulikovo anniversary in 1980. Vladimov suggests that Suslov and P.N.Demichev (in 1970 a Central Committee Secretary and candidate Politburo member) were prepared to use the nationalists against the liberal writers and dissidents, but the nationalists went too far.[44] It is certainly the case that *Molodaia gvardiia* and *Nash sovermennik* have always been hostile to liberal or cosmopolitan writers such as Evgeny Evtushenko, Andrei Voznesensky and Vasily Aksenov. Roy Medvedev reports that the nationalists were backed by the Main Political Administration of the Armed Forces and the Central Committee of the Komsomol.[45]

A number of attacks on the Russian nationalists, following Suslov's moves against them, came from the CPSU Central Committee journal *Kommunist* and from Party ideologists. V.Ivanov in *Kommunist* in November 1970 came out against the "single stream" *(edinyi potok)* view of Russian history which minimized class conflict. He criticized the attacks of both *Iunost'* and *Novyi mir* on *Molodaia gvardiia* for going too far. Concerning Dementev, he wrote: "In the contemporary ideological struggle it is impermissible to belittle the danger of the influence of bourgeois ideology."[46] On the other hand, he mentioned the articles by Chalmaev, lu.Ivanov and Semanov, and deprecated the "non-social, non-class, anti-historical approach to the cultural legacy, so insistently brought out by a series of authors in *Molodaia gvardiia!*". Chalmaev was guilty of idealizing the patriarchal village. Historians such as Semanov deviated from Marxism-Leninism to try to "find in the policy of autocracy some 'progressive' features, which supposedly facilitated the strengthening of national consciousness."[47]

The following year A.N.Iakovlev, later to become a leading ally of Gorbachev but then acting head of the Propaganda Department of the Central Committee, published in *Literaturnaia gazeta* a long and detailed attack on both official and dissident nationalism. From a traditional Leninist viewpoint, he attacked the

derevenshchiki for seeking an eternal, classless morality; *Molodaia gvardiia* for its positive portrayal of nineteenth-century conservatives; and Solzhenitsyn for anti-communism.[48] The article led to his removal from the Propaganda Department and demotion to be Ambassador in Ottawa.[49]

Russian nationalism in literature and art, 1970±81

Russian nationalism in literature, art and the study of history flourished throughout the 1970s. The *derevenshchiki* passed from a preoccupation with the village to wider concerns about life and morality.[50] In the idea, frequently implicit in their writings, that Russia's future was best secured by a return to what they considered to be peasant values, they had (and have) much in common with the Slavophils and Dostoevsky. Unlike their nineteenth-century predecessors, however, there is little to suggest that the village prose writers see Russia as a model for the rest of the world. Their concern is solely with Russian problems, and not even with the non-Russian republics of the Soviet Union (although they had their counterparts there).

Vasily Ivanovich Belov was born in 1932 in Vologda *oblast',* and won fame with his story "A Normal Situation", published in *Sever (The North)* in January 1966. Ivan Afrikanovich, the hero of "A Normal Situation", became an archetype of village prose as a well-intentioned, easy-going peasant.[51] Belov progressed from a defence of the peasants' immediate interests to the position in his novel *Kanuny* (*Eves,* 1972–6), partly published in *Sever,* of arguing that the New Economic Policy should have been continued at the end of the 1920s as an alternative to collectivization.[52]

The most popular of the *derevenshchiki* was Valentin Grigorevich Rasputin. Successive volumes of his stories, in print runs of hundreds of thousands, would sell out immediately and become unobtainable. This was normally the case with the most valuable Soviet literary creations. Rasputin was born in the Siberian village of Ust-Uda on the Angara in 1937 and has stayed in Siberia all his life. As well as depicting the hardships of the Russian peasants in different periods of Soviet history, he came to challenge the whole notion of progress.

His "Money for Maria" (*Angara,* April 1967) depicts the poverty on the *kolkhozy* and the cruel behaviour of the authorities.[53] The story "Live and Remember" (*Nash sovremennik,* October-November 1974), deploys religious symbolism and reveals his debt to Dostoevsky. The relationship between the deserter Andrei and his wife Nastyona echoes that between Raskolnikov and Sonia in *Crime and Punishment,*[54] while the behaviour of Andrei himself comes to resemble that of one of Dostoevsky's *Devils*.

Rasputin's novel "Farewell to Matyora" (*Nash sovremennik,* October-November 1976) depicts the preparations for the death of a village, Matyora. The village and the island of the same name are to be flooded for a hydroelectric power scheme. His positive character, the old peasant woman Daria, believes that people have forgotten their God-given place and have no right to interfere with

the environment. Rasputin seems to be recalling Dostoevsky's concept: if there is no God, then "all is permitted". In the epoch of the scientific and technological revolution, Daria knows that if people deify technology they will become its slaves. Daria's religion, it should be pointed out, has pagan elements; she prays to the sun but considers herself a Christian. Daria follows Rasputin's earlier peasant-women protagonists—Maria in "Money for Maria", Anna in "Borrowed Time" (*Nash sovremennik,* July-August 1970) and Nastyona in "Live and Remember". They are mother figures in whom moral values are concentrated, especially the readiness for self-sacrifice. David Gillespie suggests that these women symbolize "Mother Russia".[55] They evoke memories of Solzhenitsyn's Matryona.[56] The end of Matyora is presented in apocalyptic terms with the waters threatening not only the island but the lives of Daria and the other old people who refuse to be evacuated.

Rasputin was beaten up twice after the appearance of "Matyora", in 1977 and 1980, although there is no evidence to link this with any official organs.[57] In 1983 he made clear his philosophical orientation: "there were and are (and will be, in my view) no phenomena in literature deeper, more central, more human-directed and eternal than Dostoevsky."[58]

From the mid-1970s, religious themes became almost a regular feature in literary journals. Belov wrote a series of essays entitled "Harmony" (*Nash sovremennik,* 1979–81), investigating the attitudes and customs of the peasant in old Russia.[59] Proskurin's hero, a CPSU *oblast'*committee secretary, comes to see Orthodoxy as the spiritual foundation of Russia.[60] Many writers, including the poet Valentin Sorokin, emphasized the role of the Orthodox Church in the Russian defeat of the Tatars and Mongols at Kulikovo Field in 1380.[61] This trend in literature reflected the wider tendency among sections of the intelligentsia towards the study of religious thought, especially that of Dostoevsky, Solovyov and the *Vekhi* writers.[62]

The journal *Nash sovremennik* attracted many of those *derevenshchiki* who had previously published in *Novyi mir*. In November 1968 the composition of the *Nash sovremennik* editorial board had been almost entirely replaced. The new chief editor was the poet and *derevenshchik* Sergei Vikulov, who had been deputy editor of *Molodaia gvardiia* until August 1968. He signed the 1969 attack on *Novyi mir*. In the 1970s he made *Nash sovremennik* the principal centre of Russian nationalism. Vikulov adhered to the view that the peasants were the best representatives of Russian traditions.[63] From June 1981 the journal carried a slogan "Russia—my Motherland". This was a bold nationalist statement, in view of the traditional position that the motherland for Soviet citizens was the USSR as a whole.

Turning from literature to art, religious motifs were never far from the art of Glazunov. His portraits of Russian historical figures such as Ivan the Terrible and Boris Godunov conveyed religious images, and other paintings were primarily religious in content. An example is "The Eve. Before the Battle of Kulikovo", showing St Sergii of Radonezh. Many of his paintings include

iconographic figures. Like the Orthodox Church hierarchy, Glazunov was a faithful ambassador of the Soviet Union abroad. He visited Vietnam in 1967 during the war, and Chile in 1973, where he painted a portrait of President Salvador Allende. In 1977 his enigmatic "Mystery of the Twentieth Century" became widely known. Christ appears above a collection of political leaders and cultural figures, including Lenin, Stalin, Nicholas II, Churchill, Solzhenitsyn and the Beatles. His "Return of the Prodigal Son" shows a penitent Russian youth in jeans returning to a peasant father who is surrounded by Russian saints and heroes. Widespread Russian interest in Glazunov was indicated by the attendance at his art exhibition, featuring national and religious themes. In Moscow in 1978 500,000 people came, and perhaps a million in his native Leningrad in 1979.[64] *Pravda* published a review of" the exhibition in Moscow, by the *gosudarstvennik* historian Dmitry Zhukov. The latter appraised Glazunov's patriotism positively, but criticized his "partiality to religious motifs", and his failure to depict events such as "the birth of the mighty Soviet State".[65] Oleg Volkov entitled his *Nash sovremennik* review of the exhibition "I saw Russia".[66]

At the exhibition in Moscow, Glazunov met the priest Dimitry Dudko. He later approvingly quoted to some of Dudko's followers Dostoevsky's aphorism that one could not be Russian without being Orthodox.[67] Glazunov encountered much opposition from the Union of Artists but had the support of the RSFSR Writers' Union. Olga Carlisle wrote in 1978: "In Moscow it is generally recognized that Glazunov, a virulent anti-Semite, is a KGB official, although he denies it."[68] Undoubtedly, Glazunov became accepted by the top Party leaders; he painted a portrait of Suslov, which pleased the ideology Secretary, and his portrait of Brezhnev was published in Sofronov's *Ogonek*.[69] This does not, of course, make him a KGB official. The Russian nationalist dissident Leonid Borodin (see Chapter 7) wrote a samizdat article in 1978 praising Glazunov's art and his Orthodox symbols. He declared:

> To those who see in I.Glazunov's official status something almost obliterating his whole activity, I would like to remind or make clear that we are not striving for revolution, in which "whoever is not with us is against us", but for the transformation of all our people, our nation, all strata and levels.[70]

Russian nationalism in history, 1970±81: Likhachev, the *gosudarstvenniki* and Kulikovo

The advocates of the Russian national cultural revival have been referred to as the *voyozhdentsy*. The leading historian among them was Academician Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachev. Born in 1906, he served time in Stalin's prison camps but was rehabilitated under Khrushchev. He became the Director of the Department of the Literature of Ancient Rus' at the Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkin

House) of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Leningrad division. He played a major role in VOOPIiK. In 1975 he was beaten up and had a rib broken in circumstances suggesting the involvement of the authorities. He had previously refused to sign an attack on the dissident Academician Andrei D. Sakharov.[71]

The *gosudarstvenniki* in the late 1970s seemed to be becoming increasingly influential. In 1976 Semanov became editor-in-chief of the journal of the Ministry of Justice, *Chelovek i zakon (Person and Law),* which henceforth took a strong anti-Semitic line. He produced a collection, "The Heart of the Motherland" in 1977, calling himself a *gosudarstvennik* and attacking "rootless cosmopolitanism". According to Semyon Reznik, Semanov respected the Tsars, and also Lenin and Stalin, and opposed all the opponents of Russian governments, from the Decembrists onwards, apart from the Bolsheviks. Thus his biography *Brusilov* praised the General's loyalty to the Tsar and to the Bolsheviks. Semanov, like the National Bolsheviks, elevated the Russian State above all else.[72] While Semanov was editor of *Chelovek i zakon,* the journal *Kommunist* carried an article on the need to preserve historical monuments and works of art, attributed to the "collective correspondent" of *Kommunist,* the journal *Chelovek i zakon*[73] Chalmaev, for his part, showed his *gosudarstvennik* credentials when he complained in *Moskva* about writers who placed "ethical-moral problems over State-patriotic ones".[74] This appeared to be an attack on the *derevenshchiki* as well as the liberals.

On 21 December 1977, a meeting was held in the Moscow writers' headquarters at which anti-Semitic statements were openly expressed by the deputy director of the Gorky Institute of World Literature, Pyotr Palievsky. Anatoly Efros, a theatre director of Jewish nationality, objected to the proceedings and was sent an anonymous note saying: "Organize your own national theatre and mutilate Russian classics there as you wish."[75] Efros was supported only by Evtushenko. Kozhinov was forced to deny accusations of anti-Semitism, but (after Efros had read out the anonymous note) informed the meeting that his wife had stopped going to Efros's theatre because of what Efros did to Chekhov's plays.[76]

When the *gosudarstvennik* critic Iury Ivanovich Seleznyov (1939–84) succeeded Semanov as editor-in-chief of the series *Zhizn' zamechatel'nykh liudei* it became an instrument of the *gosudarstvenniki,* promoting a positive attitude to tsarism. According to the *gosudarstvennik* ideology, the non-Russians supposedly all joined the Russian State voluntarily. It was only in the nineteenth century that the Empire began to degenerate under the influence of "cosmopolitanism"; the October Revolution put the State back on the "national" path. Anti-Semitic innuendoes were a regular feature of the series.[77] Still more significant was the wide popularity enjoyed by Valentin S.Pikul's novel, *On the Brink,* published in *Nash sovremennik* from April to June 1979. This depicted a supposed Jewish-Masonic plot against Russia during the First World War, with the monk Rasputin being a Zionist agent.[78]

A major occasion for an outburst of Russian national feeling was the 600th anniversary in September 1980 of the battle of Kulikovo Field. In October 1979 the RSFSR Council of Ministers announced a number of measures to celebrate the anniversary, including the repair of monuments, in particular the Church of St Sergii of Radonezh.[79]

Two weeks later, *Pravda* carried an article by Academician Likhachev on the importance of preserving Russia's historic and cultural environment and linking this to the Kulikovo celebrations. He described how a Moscow church had once conveyed to him a "mysterious idea"; but this church had later been destroyed, in the 1930s.[80] In March 1980 *Novyi mir* featured an important article by Likhachev, "Notes about Russianness".[81] In this he defended patriotism and distinguished it from nationalism. Nationalism was "based on hate towards other peoples", while patriotism was "based on love for one's own" people.[82] This, with other parts of the article, appears to be a rebuke to the *gosudarstvennik.* He discussed the relationship of Russian patriotism to history, nature, the open spaces and the Russian character. He also wrote of the beauty of the English countryside and the Scottish Highlands, and the influence of European culture on Russia. It was the ability of Pushkin to make his own the culture of all Europe which led Dostoevsky to consider him "the ideal of the Russian person".[83] Likhachev also argued that Russia had a responsibility to protect and develop the cultures of the peoples which history had joined to Russia. The article was later expanded to a book which passed through two editions.[84] Likhachev was also, in 1980, allowed to edit a volume on the architecture of the Solovetsky Islands in the White Sea. The islands were the site of an old Orthodox monastery, and later of the camp where Likhachev himself was a prisoner.[85]

Valentin Rasputin devoted an article to Kulikovo in *Sovetskaia kul'tura,* the newspaper of the Culture Department of the Central Committee. It was based on Blok's poem "Kulikovo Field". Rasputin expressed a view often repeated in 1980, that the Russian people had saved Europe at Kulikovo, but at a huge cost to themselves. The battle was of great significance: "Russia of course did not begin with Kulikovo Field, but she was given direction and defined by it." Blok had predicted a return to such events as the battle; and Rasputin asked: "Will it not be our fate to go out on Kulikovo Field, in order again to defend Russian land and Russian blood?"[86]

A number of books were published in 1980 to commemorate the anniversary. A curious feature of some of the writing about Kulikovo concerned the national composition of the army which faced the Muscovites. While it had traditionally been referred to as Mongol, Tatar or Mongol-Tatar, the *gosudarstvenniki* and others saw an opportunity to portray Kulikovo as an example of the "struggle against cosmopolitanism". Anatoly Kirpichnikov, leaning to the more traditional view, referred to "Mongol-Tatar troops". He explained in a footnote that the forces of the Golden Horde were ethnically mixed, but the "Mongols (Tatars) constituted the nucleus of the ruling class."[87]

From the *gosudarstvenniki,* Seleznyov wrote an article on Kulikovo in *Nash sovremennik*. He portrayed the battle as a victory not only for the Russians, but as "a festival for all the peoples of the country". He listed the Tajiks, Kirghiz, Kazakhs, Turkmen and Uzbeks as having thrown off the yoke of the Golden Horde after Kulikovo (although in reality some of these peoples had not come into existence at the time). He dissociated the Tatar population of the USSR from the Mongol-Tatar invaders, by saying that the occupying Tatars had left their name to the people of the Volga who were formerly Bulgars. Like other writers at this time, he avoided using the term "Tatar yoke" and referred instead to the "yoke of the Golden Horde". As was commonplace, he saw historical continuity in the victory at Kulikovo and the defeats of Napoleon and the Nazis. What distinguished Seleznyov's approach from that of traditional Soviet scholarship was his description of the Horde as "cosmopolitan". This allowed him to make a link with modern imperialism, which he said was also a cosmopolitan phenomenon. The Golden Horde was a denationalized group: similarly, Napoleon and Hitler did not represent the national interests of the French or the Germans.[88]

Loshchits' biography of *Dmitrii Donskoi* in the *Zhizn zamechatel'nykh liudei* series, similarly, referred to the "cosmopolitan invasion of the Russian land". Although the leaders of the enemy army were Tatar—Mongol, their forces included many races and religions—pagans and shamanists, Muslims, Catholics, Jews and Karaites. Even the Genoese infantry was cosmopolitan and not purely Italian.

> The battle of 8 September 1380 was not a battle of peoples. It was a battle of the sons of the Russian people with the cosmopolitan conscripted or bought rabble, which had no right to speak in the name of any of the peoples of Rus'.

The anniversary was thus a festival for all the peoples of the Soviet Union.[89] The *gosudarstvennik* position was to be taken still further in 1981 by Kozhinov, who spoke of the victory of the so-called "multinational Russian *[Rossiiskoe]* State", rather than of the Russian people (see pp. 111–12).

The Russian Orthodox Church sought also to gain from the anniversary. Eight of the twelve issues of the *Zhurnal Moskovshoi patriarkhii* for 1980 had material on Kulikovo. An article on Andrei Rublyov linked his icon-painting to the defeat of the Tatars.[90] Archbishop Pitirim of Volokolamsk, the editor of the journal, claimed: "The decisive victory, determining the cultural and historical tasks of the whole Russian people, was inspired and prepared in the SergiiTrinity Monastery."[91] In December a feature emphasized the Church's role in consolidating Russian patriotism. Patriarch Pimen claimed that the Kulikovo battle had great significance not only for Russia, but also "for the peoples and states of Europe, which at the cost of huge losses for Rus' were saved from alien invasion."[92]

Despite his opposition to nationally-minded trends, Feliks Kuznetsov hailed Kulikovo as a moral and spiritual victory of the Russian people. Even he sounded a note of Russian messianism in a quotation from Pushkin: "The developing Enlightenment was saved by a devastated and dying Russia". The West should remember its debt to the Russian people. Having defeated the Horde and the Nazis, the country was now trying to save the world from the "apocalypse" of nuclear annihilation.[93] In Andrei Tarkovsky's film *Mirror* (made in 1974 but not released until 1979), Pushkin's words about Russia being a shield protecting Europe from the Tatars were read while footage was shown of Soviet soldiers defending the border against Chinese soldiers who were aggressively shaking Mao's Red Book. Vladimir Kuprin, in his collection on Kulikovo, also took up the theme of self-sacrifice. "In the Kulikovo battle was revealed the main distinguishing feature of the Russian national character—to sacrifice oneself in the name of saving others."[94]

The wave of Russian national feeling, linked with the Kulikovo anniversary, was reinforced by the lavish praise for the "great Russian people" which was coming from official platforms. In the cultural sphere, three groups could be broadly distinguished in regard to Kulikovo. Both the anti-nationalists, such as Feliks Kuznetsov, and the *vozrozhdentsy,* such as Rasputin and Likhachev, emphasized the victory of the Russian people. The *gosudarstvenniki,* such as Seleznyov and Kozhinov, emphasized the victory of the Russian State, and linked this with the struggle against "cosmopolitanism". It might also be suggested that the memory of the Russian victory over the Tatars would psychologically strengthen the image of Russian domination over the Muslim peoples in the Soviet Union, and the Russian ability to crush unwelcome religious or physical influences from Afghanistan, at a time when the Soviet invasion of December 1979 was having unfavourable effects on some Central Asians. In May 1981, *Kommunist* seemed to reflect a mixture of *gosudarstvennik* and *vozrozhdenie* influences when it attacked "bourgeois-consumerist cosmopolitanism" and linked Soviet patriotism with the historical memory of the people and the Kulikovo battle.[95]

Up to about the middle of the 1970s, the Brezhnev leadership seems to have been hostile to the more extreme forms of Russian nationalism, as is shown by the moves against *Molodaia gvardiia,* but supportive of milder forms, as is suggested by the demotion of the anti-nationalist Iakovlev. In the later 1970s, however, with the general "decline in social discipline" went a relaxation of ideological control. The Politburo seems to have drifted into a situation where Marxist-Leninist values were regularly being challenged by Russian patriotic and religious feelings, without any single member of the leadership (after the fall of Poliansky in 1976) being obviously responsible for promoting this.

7
The Brezhnev era
Dissident Russian messianism

This chapter will examine the activity and thought of the unofficial Russian nationalist movement under Brezhnev. The movement produced a revival of Russian messianism in the uncensored literature of samizdat, written by revolutionaries, oppositionists and dissidents. I focus on the underground revolutionary Russian Orthodox organization, VSKhSON; dissent within the Russian Orthodox Church; the samizdat journal *Veche*; the writings of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn; the ideas of Gennady Shimanov: and the preaching of Fr Dimitry Dudko. This period saw the articulation of the idea of combining Russian messianism and Orthodoxy with the official structures of the Soviet State.

The All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Emancipation of the People (VSKhSON)

Of importance in the political development of Russian messianism was the All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Emancipation of the People (VSKhSON). This was both the first post-Stalin political organization known to have a Russian Orthodox orientation and the largest revolutionary organization to be uncovered from the death of Stalin until then. The aims and history of the group have been described in some detail in the very useful book by John B. Dunlop.[1]

VSKhSON was founded in Leningrad in February 1964, and survived, although the KGB knew of its existence for about two years before arresting its members in February 1967. At the end it had nearly 30 members and 30 candidate members. Its membership was overwhelmingly from the intelligentsia, and its original base was in Leningrad University. The leader was Igor Viacheslavovich Ogurtsov, born in 1937 in Stalingrad, who was taken to Leningrad when very young. His charismatic personality played a major role in the creation of the group. The deputy leader and head of security, Mikhail Iukhanovich Sado, born in Leningrad in 1934, was of Assyrian nationality; both were in the Faculty of Oriental Studies at Leningrad University. The chief ideologist was Evgeny Aleksandrovich Vagin, a Dostoevsky specialist, born in Pskov in 1938. Among the rank and file was Leonid Ivanovich Borodin, born in

Irkutsk in 1938, a headmaster (mentioned above).[2] According to Vagin, who emigrated in 1976, the formation of the group was the culmination of political discussions which had begun in 1960. They were aware of the Novocherkassk workers' uprising of 1962 and believed that it might be repeated on a countrywide scale.[3] The secret organization aimed over a period of 15 or 20 years to recruit 10,000 members, and then stage a *coup d'état* by high-ranking military officers to overthrow the CPSU[4]

The VSKhSON Programme followed the teachings of the early Slavophils in seeing socialism as the offspring of capitalism, and opposing them both. In their place, it offered "Social Christianity". The economy was to be mixed and "personalized", a rather vague formulation implying some degree of worker coownership after large-scale privatization. All companies would have to be organized in "corporations" corresponding to the branch of industry; although this idea is reminiscent of Italian fascism, it was justified on the grounds of social welfare. There would be a Popular Assembly *(veche)* elected from the localities and corporations. Its decisions could be vetoed by a Supreme Council (Sobor), one-third of which would be from the upper hierarchy of the Orthodox Church and two-thirds "outstanding representatives of the people, elected for life".[5] The Head of State, elected by the Supreme Council and confirmed by popular vote, would nominate the Prime Minister, who would be responsible to the Popular Assembly and the Head of State. The right of political opposition in the Assembly would be guaranteed, together with freedom of association. These ideas are in line with the opposition of the early Slavophils to a strong State. But the Programme rejected both a single-party system and a multi-party system.[6] On a Radio Liberty programme, after he had emigrated, Vagin told Levitin-Krasnov that the organization had not envisaged universal elections. Russia was to be run by "the best people". Levitin-Krasnov commented in his memoirs that this meant a new dictatorship.[7] Vagin later provided a fuller reiteration of his view.[8] His defence of the need for a hereditary monarchy may not, however, reflect the feelings of other VSKhSON leaders at the time.[9]

The messianism of VSKhSON was primarily universalist. "Universal Christianity, which is in process of uniting, is laying the religio-cultural foundations for supranational unity." Even a (non-Slavophil) note of sympathy for Catholicism creeps in.[10] The universalist works of Berdiaev, especially "The New Middle Ages" and *The Russian Idea* were considered among the classical texts of the organization. Indeed, Osipov's article on VSKhSON was called "The Berdiaev Circle in Leningrad".[11] Vagin said in 1977 that Dostoevsky's *pochvennichestvo,* Solovyov and Berdiaev had been the major formative influences on the group, and they were also interested in the social doctrine of the Catholic Church. He, however, had come to reject Berdiaev and follow Danilevsky, Leontev and especially Fyodorov.[12] lury Galanskov, on meeting Borodin and another member in the camps, wrote that the Social Christians "maintain that Orthodoxy is the thought of the Russian people and that Russia will save the world from all corruption".[13] Such a statement of the group's

Russian messianism is stronger than appears in their documents. Galanskov himself died in the camps a "Russian patriot".[14]

There were also nationalist elements in the group's messianism. One area on which the Programme is silent is that of the non-Russian nationalities of the USSR. The impression is left that the group wished to maintain the existing frontiers of the Soviet Union. In interviews conducted with Vagin in emigration, the issue was not raised.[15] Andrei Amalrik reports that when in 1977 he asked Vagin what he wanted to do with the Soviet Muslims, "he only shrugged".[16] As far as the East Europeans were concerned, the Programme was more forthright. "Those foreign countries in which Soviet forces are temporarily stationed can be offered help to initiate their own national self-determination on the basis of Social-Christianity."[17]

At the trials of the members in November-December 1967 and March-April 1968, Ogurtsov was given fifteen years' imprisonment and five years' exile for "treason", Sado thirteen years' imprisonment, and nineteen others received lesser sentences. The use of the "treason" charge rather than merely "anti-Soviet activity" does imply the seriousness with which the KGB regarded the case. Over thirty years later, Borodin (since 1993 editor-in-chief of the literary journal *Moskva*) argued that only an Orthodox leadership could have prevented the collapse of the Soviet State.[18]

Dissent within the Russian Orthodox Church and Russian messianism

The fall of Khrushchev ended the extreme measures of the anti-religious campaign and led to a thaw in relations between the State and the churches. Levitin-Krasnov believes that Khrushchev's fall saved himself from imminent arrest.[19] Some members of the Russian Orthodox clergy began to write appeals to the new leaders to improve the conditions for the Church, and to the Patriarch and bishops about their close relations with the regime. In summer 1965 Archbishop Ermogen of Kaluga and seven bishops asked Patriarch Aleksii to rescind the decisions of the 1961 Sobor. The Holy Synod responded by confining the archbishop to a monastery. At the end of 1965, the two Moscow priests Iakunin and Eshliman sent appeals to President N.V.Podgorny and Aleksii. Further appeals followed from the two priests in 1966 and from Ermogen in 1967–1968. The priests were suspended from their parishes in May 1966.[20] These protests were not spontaneous. Levitin-Krasnov tells of a strategy meeting in spring 1965 attended by Eshliman, Iakunin, Father Aleksandr Men, Father Dimitry Dudko, Feliks V.Karelin and himself.[21] One can speak of a dissident movement within the Orthodox Church at this stage, paralleling the human rights movement, although the Church dissidents had much less support from the hierarchy than the human rights dissidents initially received from leading writers and scientists.[22]

The November 1965 appeal of Eshliman and Iakunin to the Patriarch emphasized the importance of Russian Orthodoxy both for world Christianity and for the Russian State, including ideas of Russian messianism.

> There can be no doubt that the Russian Church has a special role to play in the great universal task of a new Christian renaissance. There is much to convince us of this.
>
> Despite its tragic situation…the Russian Church still remains the largest of all autocephalous Orthodox Churches and the most influential representative of catholic Orthodoxy among other Christian confessions. The historical fate of the Russian Church is inseparably linked with the fate of the Russian people, whose role in world history has been steadily increasing for the past five hundred years.[23]

Eshliman and Iakunin continued by describing the contribution of the Church to Russian culture, and in creating a national consciousness directed against the Tatars.

> The religious zeal of St. Sergius and of his disciples ideologically paved the way for the uniting of national territories around the principality of Muscovy, brought about a great renaissance of Russian culture in Moscow and inspired the people to a decisive struggle with the Tartars.
>
> It would not be an exaggeration to say that the State of Muscovy was literally nurtured by the Russian Church.[24]

Like the Slavophils, the two priests attacked the subordination of the Church to the State by Peter I, but they said that the situation had become far worse since Sergii had allowed the Church to be dominated by the atheistic State. Referring to the reign of Khrushchev, they asked the government to remove the effects of "subjectivism and bureaucracy in leadership" on Church life.[25]

It should not be thought that all those active in the dissident movement within the Church were Slavophils. Levitin-Krasnov (born 1915) described himself in 1966 as "a Christian, a socialist and a democrat".[26] His father was a baptized Jew, his mother Orthodox, and he remained Orthodox throughout his life, being thoroughly imbued with Russian culture.[27] In 1967 he wrote to Pope Paul VI: "The construction of industry without a bourgeoisie is a great historical victory of the Russian people." In his *Stromaty* (1968) he wrote: "The October Revolution was a great victory of the Russian people."[28] His concern for human rights was not confined to the Church: from 1965 he participated in the mainstream human rights movement, signing petitions and joining the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR, formed in 1969.[29] He was subsequently arrested and sent to a labour camp. In the final volume of his memoirs, "Native Space" (1980), he called for a fourth revolution in Russia, to establish democracy and socialism. Citing Belinsky, Herzen, Lavrov and

Mikhailovsky among his mentors, he clearly is in the narodnik tradition, embellished by Orthodox belief, but without emphasizing an exclusive role for Russia.[30]

The "Fetisov group", including the economist A.A.Fetisov and the architect M.F.Antonov, took a chauvinist position quite different from those just mentioned. They claimed that the Jews had created chaos in Europe for 2, 000 years, until Hitler and Stalin, embodying the "German and Slav principles", had ended this. The group's programme called for the restoration of the *obshchina* in European Russia and the transfer of industry and the working class to Siberia. Fetisov left the CPSU in early 1968, allegedly in protest against de-Stalinization, although by then that process had ceased. Shortly thereafter the members of the group were put in mental hospitals.[31]

The growth of Russian nationalism and Russian messianism among the intelligentsia was confronted by the pseudonymous Orthodox writers of the "Metanoia" symposium, circulated in samizdat and published in the Paris *Vestnik Russkogo Studencheskogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia (Herald of the Russian Student Christian Movement)* in 1970. The articles called on the intelligentsia to return to the Orthodox Church, in order to bring about the liberation and renaissance of Russia and her transformation into a truly Christian people. The introductory article declared Communist rule to be an organic result of Russia's past sins, not something imposed from abroad. In place of messianism, the author proposed repentance.

> More Evil was brought into the world by Russia than by any other country, and it is impossible to return to a pre-sin state (which did not exist in Russian history). It is possible to be reborn only through *repentance*. It is the only way. Spiritual temptation lies at the basis of communism; messianic temptation lies in the idea of the religious purity and pre-eminence *[predizbrannost']* of the historical forms of Orthodoxy before other churches, and this temptation of Great-Power strength is obvious even in contemporary politics.[32]

In the same symposium, O.Altaev spoke of the "double-think" of the Soviet Russian intelligentsia, involved in the creation of the regime's ideology but alienated from and despising the ideology and the regime. He observed that intellectuals were now seeking to enlighten the government rather than the people. But the history of the intelligentsia since 1917 had been to succumb to a series of "temptations" to believe that the regime was improving, and therefore to co-operate with it. The last of these temptations was chauvinism. If the intelligentsia were to succumb to the latter, Altaev warned that the result might be "a new Russian messianism of the German National Socialist type".[33]

V.Gorsky's article in the same collection, "Russian Messianism and the New National Consciousness", argued that Russian religious messianism was the essence of Russian national consciousness. "As also in ancient Israel, at the basis

of Russian national consciousness lies the idea of the God-chosenness and religious vocation of the people, the affirmation of a special ordinance between it and God."[34] He traced Russian messianism from Filofei to the Populists, seeing in Bolshevism "the extreme revolutionization of Russian messianism".[35] Far from being a foreign import (as VSKhSON had suggested, and as Solzhenitsyn was to claim), "Great Russia nourished Bolshevism more than any other soil".[36] Russia would become free only when she rid herself of the idea of national greatness and "national renaissance", and of the idea of Russia "as the means of the future universal happiness of humanity".[37] The national task was the "renaissance of Christianity and true culture in Russia", and the achievement of a free democratic society, in which the Baltic, Ukraine, the Caucasus and Central Asia would have the right to secede.[38]

The "Metanoia" symposium was of particular importance because of the opposition it provoked from people who had not lost their faith in Russia. Borodin attacked it in *Veche,* emphasizing the large number of Jews among the Bolsheviks.[39] Solzhenitsyn's main contributions to *From under the Rubble* were rebuttals of the symposium (see pp. 97–8). G.M.Shimanov wrote that the articles revealed a hatred of everything Russian.[40]

A strong statement of Russian messianism came from a certain K.Radugin in a samizdat article published in *Vestnik*. He expounded Dostoevsky's view of Russia's religious mission, her "special apocalyptic service" to world Christianity. Dostoevsky came to his opinion not because of the greatness of the Russian State but because of the sufferings of the Russian people, the *narod-bogonosets*. Dostoevsky had caused the ancient millennial doctrines to be reborn in modern Russian Orthodoxy. He shared two basic assumptions of the apocalyptic consciousness: "unlimited greed for the realization of the absolute God here and now, on this earth and in human history—and a tragic understanding of the inevitable doom of all Utopian attempts."[41] Radugin then presented his expectations of the crucifixion and resurrection of Russia, the Messiah, and the inauguration of the universal millennium.

> Orthodox Russia climbed to Golgotha, and was crucified, and taken down from the Cross and placed in a coffin and covered with a stone….
>
> …the hour approaches of the glorious and terrible Resurrection: the earth will tremble, the stones will shatter, and the peoples of the earth shall see with great wonder the Light flowing from the East.
>
> Holy Rus' will be resurrected, and infinitely enriched by the tragic experience of centuries of suffering, will be the heart of the peoples reuniting in Christ, of the strongholds in the struggle with Antichrist, the prophetic prefiguration of the Millennial Kingdom.
>
> Holy Rus' will be resurrected, for the word is said to her heart: So be it!
>
> From the East this star is shining out.[42]

This is precisely the sort of position that "Metanoia" was rejecting. Holy Rus', the Russian people (not the Russian State) have suffered through the centuries; under the yokes of the Tatars, of Petersburg and of Communism. Through her suffering will come redemption—not only for herself but for all humanity. Radugin does not spell out the political implications of this statement; the Millennial Kingdom will be both of, and not of, this world.

[a]Slovo natsii[o]

The samizdat programme signed by anonymous "Russian Patriots", "Slovo natsii" ("A Nation's Word" or "A Nation Speaks", about 1970), took a clearly political position. The authors asserted that in the USSR the Russian people were not privileged, as widely claimed, but were exploited by the other nationalities. The Jews had a virtual monopoly on arts and science. There was no communist party for Russia, as there was for the other republics, and this weakened the Russians vis-à-vis other nationalities.[43] The document particularly attacked Ukrainian nationalism. The Crimea had been taken from the RSFSR and given to Ukraine (by Khrushchev in 1954); and its Russian population was allegedly being "forced to learn the Ukrainian language".[44] Racially mixed marriages were threatening to cause the biological degeneration of the Russian people. Russia "must become the ruling nation *[gospodstvuiushchei natsiei]*",[45] with the abolition of the Union republics and the transformation of the USSR into a Russian national state. In foreign policy, it called for an end to military confrontation between East and West, but only with the recognition by the West of Russia's uniqueness *(samobytnost')*. It proposed the withdrawal of American and Soviet forces from Europe, the abolition of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, and the reunification of Germany; a treaty with the West on the non-use of nuclear weapons; the creation of a League of Slav States; and the uniting of Russia, the United States and India against China.[46] "Long live the victory of Christian civilization over the chaos rebelling against it! Long live great, single and indivisible Russia! God be with us!"[47] In its authoritarianism, centralism and anti-egalitarianism the document recalls Leontev rather than the Slavophils, and its racism evokes memories of the Black Hundreds.

An article in *Veche* reported that "Slovo natsii" was an answer to the "anti-Russian" part of the "Programme of the Democratic Movement of the Soviet Union" (1969).[48] This programme, signed by anonymous "Democrats of Russia, Ukraine and the Baltic" advocated self-determination for all the peoples of the USSR, and cultural or economic autonomy for nations wishing to remain in the federation.[49] The *Veche* article stated that "Slovo natsii" was "a compromise between the so-called 'legal Slavophils' and yesterday's opponents of the regime",[50] in other words, between establishment and dissident Russian nationalists. Levitin-Krasnov writes that Ivanov-Skuratov (see p. 64) was the author of "Slovo natsii".[51] Indirect confirmation of this has come from Iuliia Vishnevskaia of Radio Liberty. She writes that the name of the author "was well

known in Moscow" (where she herself was at the time), and he was arrested in 1981 "on a different charge".[52] Ivanov-Skuratov was arrested in Moscow in 1981 on charges of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (see below).[53] The Moscow samizdat human rights journal, *The Chronicle of Current Events* reported on the existence of "Slovo natsii" in December 1970, and-also on the response of a democrat, V Gusarov, who criticized the "great-power and racist views of the 'patriots"'.[54]

Veche

The most significant embodiment of Russian messianist samizdat in the 1970s was in the journal *Veche* (named after the popular assemblies of ancient Kiev and Novgorod). This was the organ of several tendencies of Russian nationalism. Ten thick issues appeared between 1971 and 1974; regrettably, it does not seem possible to estimate the circulation of the journal.[55] It was founded by Vladimir Osipov (see Chapter 5), who edited and published the first nine issues. In the prison camps he had been converted to Russian Orthodoxy and Slavophilism. Freed in 1968, he settled in the town of Aleksandrov in Vladimir *oblast',* as near to Moscow as he was legally allowed, and he found work as a fireman. Visiting lury Galanskov, he met Levitin-Krasnov, who introduced him to the Orthodox priest Dimitry Dudko. The latter seems to have been an important influence on

Osipov; in January 1980 Dudko called him his "spiritual son". At least two former members of VSKhSON—Leonid Borodin and Georgy Bochevarov—joined Osipov on *Veche*.[56] Osipov's nationalism was expressed in his "Three Attitudes to the Motherland" (1970).[57] The three attitudes he identified were hatred of Russia and the Russian people; "speculation" on, and manipulation of, patriotism, as practised by the regime; and love for the nation. "Love for humanity can appear only through one's own nation." Attacking "unprincipled cosmopolitanism", he declared: "Only the Motherland, the Motherland, can regenerate the people… The nation *[natsiia],* the nation, above all."[58] Osipov rejected the ideology of the regime; but he now proclaimed his loyalty to the Soviet State. Unlike the editors of the *Chronicle of Current Events,* he printed his name and Vladimir *oblast'* address in *Veche* and distributed it through the mail. Since he was allowed to edit nine issues of the journal, from January 1971 to December 1973, a time when other samizdat journals like the *Chronicle* and the *Ukrainian Herald* were stopped, it seems clear that he was protected from above. A parallel may be drawn with Roy Medvedev, who appears to have been protected by other regime circles who wished to keep the door open to reform in the future.

Mikhail Kheifets, a Zionist activist who met Osipov in the camps (after the editor had been re-sentenced in 1975) explained the link with Suslov's attack on *Molodaia gvardiia:*

> People who had supported *Molodaia gvardiia* ideologically, Osipov told me, were mortally offended by the dispersal of its editorial board. Many of them occupied important seats and offices and considered themselves, being "Russian patriots", to be the foremost defenders of the Soviet authorities. And then they suddenly gave them such a kick in the arse! And they gave me the initial means for publishing the journal and the first literary connections.
>
> So, the *"gosudarstvenniki"* entered and occupied the key positions in the party created by a "Slavophil" [i.e. Osipov].[59]

Kheifets says that the differences between the circles which came together to produce *Veche* were greater than the differences between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. With one exception, he does not identify the officials and cultural figures who backed *Veche,* but says that in fact their financial contribution was small. The exception was Ilia Glazunov, who was more generous,[60] and about whose work and life Osipov wrote a warm and laudatory article in *Veche.*[61]

We have no first-hand account of how the situation on the editorial board developed, but we know that in March 1974 the founder, editor and publisher of *Veche,* Osipov, announced that the journal had ceased publication; and that in April 1974 most of the editorial board produced *"Veche* No. 10" without Osipov and denounced him. Aleksandr Ianov has argued, in line with his conception that dissident Russian nationalism inevitably tends, in the long term, towards collaborating with the State, be it Tsarist or Soviet, that *Veche* had two faces: "and that its liberal face, so to speak, was gradually but inexorably supplanted by its chauvinist face".[62] The view that the split in the editorial board between Osipov and the editors of *Veche* No. 10 was a split between the liberals and the chauvinists is not, however, born out by the evidence. It seems that personal factors, and perhaps the intrigues of the KGB, played a role too. For example, one of Osipov's opponents was Adel Naidenovich, who had been Osipov's third wife in a marriage of convenience, and who was the principal link between *Veche* and the human rights circle around Pyotr Iakir.[63] Further, Ivan V.Ovchinnikov, the editor of No. 10, had himself, in August 1973, co-signed with Osipov, Levitin-Krasnov, Viacheslav S.Rodionov and Valentina E.Mashkova (Osipov's wife) an appeal on the situation of Soviet political prisoners.[64] Moreover, Ivanov-Skuratov had been the author of an article in *Veche* No. 1 which decidedly placed him (at that time) among the "liberals".[65] Yet he was a key figure in the anti-Osipov group.

The role of Ivanov-Skuratov on the editorial board has been a subject of comment. He had testified against Osipov in 1961, but Osipov had apparently forgiven him. Ivanov-Skuratov had excused himself to Osipov by pointing out that he was legally a madman, and Osipov need not have confirmed his testimony. Osipov turned to him for support in publishing *Veche*. Kheifets describes Osipov as a natural organizer (rather than a thinker), who looked to Ivanov-Skuratov to be the journal's ideologist.[66] Levitin-Krasnov writes that after

Osipov (whom he describes as honest, and with whom he remained friends, despite their political differences) began publishing *Veche,* a "completely odious public" crawled on to the editorial board. Among these stood out Ivanov-Skuratov, "a thoroughly enigmatic individual".[67] Semyon Reznik reported in 1982 that Ivanov-Skuratov was in fact an atheist.[68] If he was an atheist when he was writing for *Veche,* and claiming to be Orthodox, then he was clearly playing the part of a provocateur. But it would be wrong to draw this conclusion without more evidence. Kheifets points out that Ovchinnikov, a *Veche* collaborator, had defected to the West in the 1950s and then returned to the Soviet Union, in circumstances which suggested a link with the KGB. Further, in the early 1960s, he had testified to the KGB against Iury Mashkov and the then wife of the latter, Valentina Mashkova. Both Mashkov and Mashkova collaborated on *Veche*. Iury Mashkov, however, was in the habit of denouncing Jews to the authorities. Valentina Mashkova was now married to Osipov. One can sympathize with Kheifets's point that Osipov was forced to work with some morally unprincipled people.[69]

It seems appropriate to make an attempt to summarize the contents of the most important Russian nationalist samizdat journal of the post-Stalin era.[70] The introduction to the first issue of *Veche* referred to the growth of crime, selfishness, alcoholism and the collapse of the family. It announced itself as a "RUSSIAN PATRIOTIC JOURNAL" (in block capitals) which would "continue the guiding line of the Slavophils and Dostoevsky" and seek to aid the rebirth of Russia.[71] The first article was by Ivanov-Skuratov and argued that Slavophilism was inseparable from Orthodoxy. He particularly praised Khomiakov for seeing the Russian people rather than the Church hierarchy as the bearers of Orthodoxy. Konstantin Aksakov and Ivan Kireevsky, he said, had, under the influence of German messianism, seen Russia as the ruling nation of the era, but Khomiakov had been above this. Konstantin Aksakov had rightly regarded free speech as an inalienable human right; but an obstacle to implementing this was Aksakov's own belief that the Russian people were not political, which justified the principle of autocracy. The most important contribution of the Slavophils was their emphasis on Russian national originality.[72]

The next article, however, was more chauvinist and reflected the opinion of those nationalists closer to the regime and more willing to adapt to Leninism. The title was "The Teaching of the Slavophils—the Highest Achievement of National Consciousness in Russia in the Pre-Leninist Period", and its author was the "Fetisovite" Mikhail F.Antonov (born 1927; see p. 85). Successive parts of this article appeared in the second and third issues of *Veche,* comprising over a quarter of the total number of pages of the first three issues.[73]

In the first part, Antonov attacked those who, from the Westernizers of the nineteenth century to the contributors to the *Great Soviet Encyclopaedia,* linked Slavophilism to "official *narodnost*". Paradoxically, he also claimed that Nicholas I himself had sympathies with Slavophilism, which he was politically unable to express.[74] Expounding Khomiakov's views, Antonov praised him for his

opposition to *liumpenstvo,* which Antonov identified with the tendency to fawn before the West, and for his support for Russian customs. In this context Antonov approvingly cited Vladimir Soloukhin's attempts to rediscover Russian traditions, which had led to his being accused of *"rusofil'stvo* and of abandoning proletarian internationalism".[75] The first part of Antonov's article was followed by a rejoinder by "A.S.", presumably Ivanov-Skuratov. This drew attention to the lack of clarity of the term *liumpenstvo* as used by Antonov, and to the "naive peasant belief in the good Tsar, surrounded by evil gentry", which was found in Fetisovite writings.[76] The editorial board issued statements that it was not in agreement with Antonov's views,[77] and that the article was being printed "without the sanction of the author" (in blocks).[78]

In the second part, Antonov discussed Khomiakov's views on philosophy, religion, the Slavs and the *obshchina,* and announced: "Again and again we have to underline one thought: in the *obshchina* is the essence of Russia, the Russian people and Leninism."[79] This last word explained why A.S., in his earlier rejoinder, had criticized Antonov for portraying Lenin as seeing the regeneration of Russia coming from the village rather than the town.[80] Antonov's final part (considerably shortened, according to an editorial note) outlined the views of the Kireevsky brothers. Emphasizing the need to return to Russian ways, he condemned the contemporary attempt of "rootless and cosmopolitan elements" to destroy the old centre of Moscow and make it a copy of European capitals.

> The idea of Moscow as the Third Rome, as the New Jerusalem, as the embodiment of Lenin's highest Truth and Justice on Earth—this is what ought to lie…as the basis of the General Plan for the Reconstruction and Development of Moscow.[81]

Ivan Kireevsky could not link the teachings of the Church Fathers with changes in Russian life; only Lenin could do this. An adequate Russian ideology could come only from "the unification of Orthodoxy and Leninism". Communist morality would benefit from an infusion of the teachings "proceeding from the deepest origins of Russian life". In a discussion which contained no analysis of Lenin's real ideas, Antonov declared: "Leninism has incomparably more in common with Orthodoxy and the Slavophils than with Marxism-Catholicism."[82]

A major article spanning three issues, attributed later to Ivanov-Skuratov, praised the achievements of Gen. M.D.Skobelev in the 1877–8 Russo-Turkish War and the conquest of Central Asia.[83] This ran alongside a pro-messianist viewpoint put by the anonymous author of "Thoughts-Projectors", which argued that Russia's sufferings gave her a special position in the world.

> Russia is hated, Russia is accused, Russia is said to be going to perish… But all the same the main thing is that Russia is not understood. All the judgements about her are human conjecture.
>
> Russia is the greatest sufferer, slandered and crucified.[84]

A comparison between Israel and Russia was made in No. 7 by I.Starozhubaev. "The springing-up of Russian nationalism in the sense of self-defence and self-preservation is a natural desire for today." He attacked cosmopolitanism, and those shouting for freedom and democracy; he spoke instead of the broad Russian soul and of messianism—Russia saving all mankind through her example. His main theme was that Russian nationalism was defensive.[85]

Ivanov-Skuratov wrote two articles on Solzhenitsyn's *August 1914,* accusing him of being pro-German and anti-Russian in his portrayal of the collapse of the Russian Army.[86] The fifth issue carried further discussion of the novel[87] and contained two chapters of the memoirs of Solzhenitsyn's first wife, Natalia Reshetovskaia; and the ninth contained two new chapters from Solzhenitsyn's *First Circle*.[88] The *Veche* editors were clearly split in their attitude to Solzhenitsyn. Osipov was ideologically close to him, as later became clear in his response to Solzhentsyn's *Letter to the Soviet Leaders,* but Ivanov-Skuratov and the *gosudarstvenniki* considered him to be anti-Soviet. Osipov had sought Solzhenitsyn's collaboration on *Veche,* but he had refused on the grounds that the line of the journal was unclear. According to Kheifets, Osipov was very upset at the prospect of Solzhenitsyn's divorce, because of his central position in the Russian national movement. Like many Russian nationalists, Osipov saw the hand of the Masons in the calamities affecting Russia. He suspected that the Masons were behind Solzhenitsyn's attraction to Natalia Svetlova, who was to become his second wife. When Osipov went to warn Solzhenitsyn about the Masons, Solzhenitsyn told him that his fears were "exaggerated".[89] The appearance of Solzhenitsyn's chapters in No. 9, with Solzhenitsyn's permission, attests to the continuing strength of the liberal nationalist tendency in *Veche* right up to the end.

The belief in the need for respect for other nationalities was reflected in the article in the sixth issue, entitled "The Russian Solution of the National Question", dedicated to the fiftieth anniversary of the USSR. In contrast to the position of "Slovo natsii", it was a defence of Soviet federalism. "The new federation of peoples was created in the Russian manner." It preserved

> the tradition of respect for other peoples, the UNIVERSALITY of the Russian person, to which Dostoevsky pointed, universality as compassion and love for others…
>
> The union of equal republics, preserving their national uniqueness, by its very structure shows what distinguishes internationalism from cosmopolitanism.

The article attacked Russification, recalling Lenin's attack on Stalin for great-power chauvinism, and claiming that the latter was mainly instigated by non-Russians. It rejected the idea of a single Soviet nation *(natsiia),* pointing out that the nationality question specialist S.Kaltakhchian had denounced this in *Pravda* (17 March 1972). Paraphrasing the State anthem, the article expressed pride that

Great Rus' had gathered together a multinational great power.[90] A similar position was expressed in the anonymous article in No. 7, "The Struggle with So-Called Russophilism [rusofil'stvo], or the Path to the Suicide of the State". This was an attack on lakovlev's article in *Literaturnaia gazeta,* and defended the importance of national traditions for the Soviet State. While citing Berdiaev, Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn, the author also defended the *gosudarstvennik* Semanov. Praising Lenin's internationalism, based on respect for the nation, the article linked lakovlev with cosmopolitanism, national nihilism and Trotskyism.[91] Both these articles reflected *the gosudarstvennik* trend within *Veche*.

Osipov seems to have expressed his views more clearly outside *Veche* than in it. His interview with two American correspondents in April 1972 included an attack on "world cosmopolitan forces" and a statement of his "very sympathetic attitude" to the human rights movement.[92] In November 1972, he distinguished his position from those he termed "legal Slavophils (Soloukhin, etc.)" by saying that he was not a Marxist. (The assumption that the "legal Slavophils" themselves were "Marxists" must be questioned.) Osipov explained that the journal was not political or anti-government. It made no sense for the democratic dissidents to complain that his nationalism had points of similarity with the official ideology, because the democrats themselves based their position on the Soviet Constitution. "The problem of human rights in the USSR", said Osipov, "is LESS important at this juncture than the problem of the death of the Russian nation." This was why Osipov had moved from active opposition to the regime. If the Russian people were to return to Orthodoxy, they would be sure to survive, but at the moment the only bridge to religion was nationalism.

> Christ and his teaching, in the final reckoning, are more important to me than nationalism. But I know the soul of the modern Russian: the national principle at this time is more alive and clear than the religious. So patriotism, national consciousness and self-respect form the only reliable bridge to moral, cultural and biological salvation![93]

Osipov's position here is like that of Father Zosima in *The Brothers Karamazov,* that belief in God's people will lead to belief in God (see p. 37).

On 7 March 1974 Osipov announced that the KGB were preparing false charges of anti-Soviet activity against him, although he had occupied a loyal position in relation to the Soviet system. He warned *Veche's* supporters that the journal had ceased publication with No. 9.[94] On 25 March the editorial board announced that Osipov had been replaced as editor.[95] On 17 April, Naidenovich, Ovchinnikov and nine other members of the editorial board (not including Ivanov-Skuratov) issued a statement claiming that Osipov had betrayed the journal and that he had made unfounded attacks on its collaborators.[96] *Veche* No. 10 was dated 19 April 1974 and included articles by Ovchinnikov, Ivanov-

Skuratov and Shafarevich. It appears to have been compiled before the split with Osipov.[97]

In July the new board announced that it was ceasing publication because a criminal case had been started against the journal.[98] Osipov, however, assisted by Rodionov, produced two issues of a new journal, *Zemlia (The Land)*. They were dated 1 August and 25 November 1974.[99] The first issue included a programmatic statement by the two editors, entitled "To the Land!" This made three major points:

1 Nationalism is unthinkable in separation from Christianity…
2 The chief task of Russian nationalism today is the resurrection of the people's morality and of the national culture.
3 The absence of *glasnost'* and of constitutional guarantees blocks the realization of the national tasks.

This final point reaffirmed Osipov's closeness to the human rights movement. The statement went on to stress continuity with the Slavophils and Dostoevsky The choice of the title *Zemlia* deliberately referred to both "native land" and to the land as the nourisher of the people.[100] Most of the two issues of the journal was devoted to the popular priest Dimitry Dudko.

On 28 November, three days after the appearance of *Zemlia* No. 2, Osipov was arrested.[101] In September 1975 Osipov was sentenced to eight years in a strict-regime labour camp. According to the *Chronicle,* Ivanov-Skuratov testified against him. The *Vestnik RKhD* reported that at the trial two witnesses had rescinded their testimony, according to which Osipov had received money from the West for the journal. The witnesses claimed that their earlier statements had been made under pressure from the investigators. The prosecutor had ignored the withdrawal of the testimony. The major accusations against Osipov, according to *Vestnik,* were that Osipov had published articles in the West, and the "chauvinistic nature of the journal". Solzhenitsyn attacked the harshness of the sentence, pointing out that Osipov had acted openly throughout. A number of representatives of the human rights movement issued protests in Osipov's support, and Academician Sakharov mentioned Osipov's participation in the defence of political prisoners and of Solzhenitsyn as factors additional to his editing of *Veche* which had led to his punishment.[102]

In a 1974 samizdat document attacking anti-Semitism, the Jewish dissident and *Veche* contributor Mikhail Agursky suggested that "neo-Nazi" circles within the regime hoped to make *Veche* their unofficial mouthpiece. Osipov and other Christian nationalists constituted a major obstacle to this, however, and these regime figures withdrew their protection from *Veche*. This allowed Osipov to be put on trial.[103] Ianov's explanation, which is compatible with Agursky's, links Osipov's trial with the decline in Poliansky's influence (and therefore in his ability to protect *Veche*), which began in 1973 and continued until he was dropped from the Politburo in 1976.[104] Shelepin, too, was losing influence,

leaving the Politburo in 1975. The moves against *Veche* coincided with the expulsion of Solzhenitsyn from the USSR and the publication of his *Letter to the Soviet Leaders* and the collection *From under the Rubble.*[105] It may be that the wide circulation given to Solzhenitsyn's nationalist views made the Brezhnev leadership more determined to clamp down on unofficial Russian nationalism (although nobody went to the camps for contributing to *From under the Rubble*). Clearly the regime was hostile both to Osipov's combination of human rights activity and Christian nationalism and to the idea of an uncensored regular *gosudarstvennik* journal, such as *Veche* might have become without Osipov.

An attempt to create a successor to *Veche,* without the participation of Osipov (and perhaps not as sympathetic to the human rights movement) was made by Borodin. The title *Moskovskii sbornik (Moscow Compendium)* evoked the periodical of that name published by the Slavophils in the 1840s. Borodin's introduction to the first issue, which appeared in September 1974, conveyed the intention of publishing materials on religious and national issues which were already in samizdat. He also included a polemical attack on Levitin-Krasnov's "The World Upside Down"—itself a critique of Solzhenitsyn's *Letter to the Leaders* (see below). Borodin ridiculed the eclecticism (or diversity) of influences on Levitin-Krasnov. The material concerning religion included Shimanov's article "Moscow, the Third Rome" (see below), a work of Agursky's on Jewish Christians and an article on Dudko. A long historical article by Ivanov-Skuratov concerned Grigory Rasputin.[106] The second issue, dated January 1975, again included articles by Ivanov-Skuratov and Shimanov, and it was dedicated to the memory of Galanskov.[107] After this, the KGB moved in, confiscating the third issue and giving Borodin a stern warning.[108]

Solzhenitsyn and Russian messianism: *Letter to the Soviet Leaders* and *From under the Rubble*

The role of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn in the Russian nationalist movement (as in the human rights movement) in the early 1970s was of great significance. So much has already been written about him and his works, however, that my discussion here can be brief.[109] Press attacks on Solzhenitsyn and on Andrei Sakharov, the other leading dissident, grew to a climax in summer 1973. Even prominent critical writers such as Chingiz Aitmatov, Vasyl Bykov and Sergei Zalygin were forced to sign petitions against him. About this time the KGB discovered *The Gulag Archipelago,* with its uncompromising insistence that the roots of Stalinism lay in Lenin's repressive policies and class-based morality. On 7 January 1974 Brezhnev asked the Politburo what to do about Solzhenitsyn. Kosygin favoured putting him on trial, but KGB Chairperson Iu.V.Andropov favoured deporting him.[110] In February 1974 Solzhenitsyn was arrested and forcibly deported to Switzerland. His *Letter to the Soviet Leaders,* completed the previous autumn, was thereupon published in the West and in samizdat. In

November the anthology *From under the Rubble,* edited by Solzhenitsyn, was launched at press conferences in Moscow and Zurich.[111]

The programme outlined in his *Letter* and in his contributions to *From under the Rubble* is authoritarian and nationalist, but comes out against Russian great-power chauvinism. A central point is that the non-Russians have the right to secede if they desire. Here Solzhenitsyn differs from the position of Shafarevich as expressed in the same volume. Shafarevich said that the Russians were at least as much the victims of communism as the other Soviet nations. There would be no benefit from the minority nationalities breaking from a post-Soviet Russia. "There is nothing to indicate the necessity of dismembering states into national atoms."[112] History had joined the peoples of the USSR together, and they now had a "historic mission…to point the way out of the labyrinth in which mankind is now lost".[113] Solzhenitsyn implicitly rejected this Russian messianism (see p. 98). He was explicit on the national minorities. "With regard to all the peoples in and beyond our borders forcibly drawn into our orbit, we can fully purge our guilt by giving them genuine freedom to decide their future for themselves."[114] In the *Letter,* he spoke of being concerned solely with Russia and Ukraine; the other republics should be allowed to leave. In the third volume of *Gulag,* he goes further (conscious of being half-Ukrainian himself), and offers the Ukrainians the right of self-determination. "We must leave the decision to the Ukrainians themselves—let federalists and separatists try their persuasions."[115]

Free of the wish to maintain an empire, the Russian government would be able to renounce Marxism-Leninism and replace it with the moral authority of Orthodoxy. The alternative would be catastrophic. Driven by ideology, the Soviet leaders had exported revolution wherever they could, including China. But now the ideological dispute with China threatened to lead to war between the two countries. Solzhenitsyn called on the Soviet leaders, as Russians, to abandon ideology to the Chinese, and to concentrate resources on Russia. Her own North and Siberia should be developed, to keep out the Chinese and revive the spirit of the Russian people. As well as renouncing the ideology, the leaders should restore some power to the Soviets.[116] Although he shares the hostility of his fellow contributor, Shafarevich, to all forms of socialism,[117] Solzhenitsyn's emphasis is on morality and repentance rather than politics. He speaks of the guilt of the Russians before other nations, but considerably softens the effect by referring to the oppression of Russians by Poles, Tatars and Latvians (in and after 1917), suggesting that the Russians, Ukrainians and Belorussians have suffered from evil governments more than anyone else.[118]

Solzhenitsyn's article "Repentance and Self-Limitation in the Life of Nations" refers to the "natural proclivity of Russians to repent".[119] But this proclivity, he says, was undermined by Nikon's and Peter's reforms. "The whole Petersburg period of our history—a period of external greatness, of imperial conceit—drew the Russian spirit even further from repentance."[120] This attitude to Peter I is shared by two other contributors to *From under the Rubble,* Vadim Borisov[121] and the pseudonymous F.Korsakov.[122] These contributors share with the early

Slavophils a tendency to idealize pre-Petrine Russia. Opposition to State chauvinism also distinguished the early Slavophils (most of the time). Solzhenitsyn succinctly describes, and condemns, what he calls National Bolshevism (although what he is describing seems closer to what I have referred to as the *gosudarstvennik* ideology than to National Bolshevism): "the Russian people are the noblest in the world…tsarism and Bolshevism are equally irreproachable…blood alone determines whether one is Russian or non-Russian".[123] Shafarevich, also attacking national megalomania, comments that *Veche's* celebration of Skobelev's conquests "looks like some sort of deliberate provocation."[124] Borisov goes so far as to call nationalism, along with universalism, an "atheist" ideology.[125]

A major factor uniting Soizhenitsyn, Borisov and the early Slavophils is the belief in the need for the spiritual rebirth of the Russian nation. In the "Metanoia" symposium (see pp. 86–7), Solzhenitsyn saw "nothing but a denunciation of the irredeemably vicious Russian people".[126] The view that at the centre of Bolshevism was Russian messianism appalled Solzhenitsyn. The Communist ideology, rooted in French and German theories, had made Russia into an occupied country whose traditions were vilified.[127] For Solzhenitsyn, as for the early Slavophils, it was the intellectuals who were the most responsible for the contemptuous attitude to things Russian. His article "The Smatterers", attacking the contemporary Soviet intelligentsia, specifically praised the *Vekhi* authors for their prescience in seeing the need to put individual moral change before institutional change. He attacked "Metanoia" and the dissidents Grigory Pomerants and Semyon Telegin for pinning their hopes on the intelligentsia rather than on the Russian people.[128] Borisov similarly attacked Pomerants, Roy Medvedev, Sakharov and other intellectuals for fearing the development of national consciousness among the Russian people.[129] Pointing out how the regime depended on the intelligentsia for its ideological support, Solzhenitsyn demanded that Russians be prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of change, to bring about a moral revolution. "Do NOT LIE! Do NOT TAKE PART IN THE LIE! Do NOT SUPPORT THE LIE!"[130] This abandonment of Leninism could, Solzhenitsyn believed, bring about the peaceful transformation of Russia.[131]

While the emphasis on peaceful change again recalled the Slavophils, one difference in Solzhenitsyn's approach was the absence of Russian messianism. For Solzhenitsyn, Russia's "national mission" is her own North and East. "The Northeast…will signify that Russia has resolutely opted for *self-limitation,* for turning inward rather than outward." Only when her own problems were solved would she begin to help others.

> When we have recovered our health and put our house in order we shall undoubtedly want to help poor and backward peoples and succeed in doing so. But not out of political self-interest, not to make them live as we do or serve us.[132]

Shafarevich was less restrained in his discussion of Russia's mission. He made the link, common in messianic thought, between suffering and redemption.

> It is hard to believe that any country has ever suffered such a multitude of catastrophes as has been unleashed on Russia during the last half century Surely they cannot have been senseless and in vain?…
>
> The whole of mankind has now entered a blind alley. It has become clear that a civilization founded on the ideology of "progress" gives rise to contradictions that that civilization cannot resolve. And it seems to me that the path to Russia's rebirth is the same as the path that will enable man to find a way out of his blind ally, to find salvation from the senseless race of industrial society, the cult of power and the darkness of unbelief. We were the first to reach this vantage point, whence the uniqueness of this path became visible, and it is now up to us to set foot on it and point the way to others. This is my idea of Russia's possible mission, the purpose which can justify her future existence.[133]

Chaadaev had suggested that Russia's purpose might be "to provide some great lesson for the world" after undergoing a period of misery (see p. 20). Shafarevich now seemed to be saying that Russia had shown where the path of socialism and atheism would lead. Through her suffering she would be a negative example for the rest of humanity, but by returning to Christianity she could illuminate the true path.

Among the contributors to *From under the Rubble,* it was Evgeny Barabanov who most clearly articulated messianic strivings. He was concerned not only with the fate of Russia and Orthodoxy, but with the crisis facing the Church (in the singular) worldwide. The Church was forgetting its "objective: the transformation of the world and of life for the glory of the approaching fullness of the Kingdom of God." When he says "we have been entrusted with the great task of transforming the world", there is some ambiguity, but the impression is that "we" is not only Russian Orthodoxy, but world Christianity.[134]

A considerable number of dissidents felt the need to comment on Solzhenitsyn's *Letter,* showing his position at the time as the leading unofficial thinker. Agursky collected fourteen articles about the *Letter* in a samizdat symposium, "What Awaits the Soviet Union?". A summary of the symposium appeared in the *Chronicle.*[135] Sakharov criticized Solzhenitsyn for his authoritarianism and for over-emphasizing the importance of ideology. He agreed with Solzhenitsyn that Russia should "refrain from imposing our socialist messianism on other countries". But he found Solzhenitsyn's nationalism reminiscent of official "anti-cosmopolitan" campaigns, and feared that it could become "dangerous" if taken up by reactionary elements among the leadership.[136] Replying to Sakharov, Solzhenitsyn rejected any accusation of "great power nationalism". Russia needed her "national consciousness" to prevent her own ruin. A strong authority, not the sudden introduction of democracy, was essential; otherwise, he wrote

with prescience, *"wars between nationalities* in our country will drown in blood the birth of democracy."[137]

Osipov expressed his disagreement with Sakharov and with the scientist's advocacy of political pluralism. He fully supported Solzhenitsyn, as did Leonid Borodin and Ivanov-Skuratov.[138] Gennady Shimanov criticized Solzhenitsyn for saying that Russia was not ripe for democracy, thereby suggesting that democracy would be appropriate for her in the future (see next section). At the other extreme, Raisa Lert argued that the "quiet" *(tikhii)* nationalism of Solzhenitsyn would "inevitably grow over" into the aggressive nationalism of Stalin.[139] Levitin-Krasnov, while agreeing with Solzhenitsyn that Christianity was Russia's only salvation, feared that the development of Siberia could only be accomplished with Stalin's methods.[140] Roy Medvedev, like Lert and Levitin-Krasnov attacking Solzhenitsyn from a socialist viewpoint, showed the extent to which Solzhenitsyn's nationalist concerns were shared by a wider public. He felt that Russian national life was hampered much more than that of the non-Russians; Russian villages were more neglected, and Moscow had almost lost its Russian traits.[141] Lev Kopelev, also a socialist, defended Marxism against Solzhenitsyn with a quotation from Berdiaev.[142] Osipov, in a further article, noted that in an important respect Roy Medvedev, Levitin-Krasnov, Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn were united in a belief which he shared: the need for gradual democratizing evolutionary changes from the top. "We must persuade the administration that the presence of a loyal opposition will not harm but will benefit the Soviet State."[143]

Gennady Shimanov

Gennady Mikhailovich Shimanov, a *Veche* contributor, differed fundamentally from Solzhenitsyn on the nature of the Soviet State. He was born in 1937 in a Communist family. In 1962 he voluntarily entered a psychiatric hospital, and at about the same time became an Orthodox Christian. In 1969 he was forcibly recommitted to a psychiatric hospital in connection with his religious beliefs and meetings organized at his home.[144] After his release he came to consider himself a Slavophil and a believer in Russian messianism.[145] The "Metanoia" symposium provoked him to write to the editor of *Vestnik RSKhD,* Nikita A.Struve, protesting against its publication. He claimed that the "Metanoia" writers hated everything Russian and suggested that they might be non-Russians, hiding behind pseudonyms. Two further letters attacked Struve for failing to publish his criticism.[146]

In a letter written in or before 1975, Shimanov compared his faith in the Russian people to his faith in God.

> [J]ust as I in my time came to belief in God, inescapably and for always, now I have come to belief in the Russian people, to a belief near to my

> heart, but because of a bad education my heritage was inaccessible to me for a long time.[147]

In moving from belief in God to belief in the Russian people, Shimanov was travelling in the direction opposite to that suggested by Father Zosima and Osipov. Like other Russian nationalists, Shimanov complained that patriotism was considered (by the liberal intelligentsia) acceptable for Jews and Tatars but was immoral, even fascist, for Russians. Pomerants was an example of this approach. "But our faith is that of Tiutchev, Gogol, Pushkin, Dostoevsky and the Slavophils… IT IS NECESSARY TO BE TOGETHER WITH THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE."[148] The Russian people, according to Shimanov, were returning to the Church; while some, in the post-Stalin ideological vacuum, looked to the West, the most sensitive turned to Orthodoxy. The Soviet government was publishing the works of Dostoevsky and Tolstoy; the Russian religious philosophers Berdiaev and Bulgakov would be studied, and "the true leaders, the Slavophils, will begin to occupy the minds of the awakening people".[149] (It should be noted that these words were written before the critical works of the classical Slavophils had been republished in the USSR.) Even Evtushenko, who was supposed to be an atheist, had used religious phraseology. A danger facing Russia, which was not yet taken seriously, was posed by Rome. The Vatican was planning the Catholicization of Russia, and *Vestnik RSKhD* was a tool in this strategy.[150]

Shimanov's answer to Solzhenitsyn was entitled "How to Understand Our History and What to Strive for in it". According to Shimanov, with the fall of Byzantium, Russia was right to feel herself the sole preserver of the true Orthodox faith. While the Mongol yoke reduced the external moral and cultural position of the people, it strengthened the Russian Orthodox soul, so that no subsequent difficulties could destroy it. The Westernization brought by Peter and his successors led to the slow decay of Russia, culminating in the democratic February Revolution. The October Revolution, on the other hand, was the end of the February Revolution and of all the previous decay. Shimanov agreed with Orthodox priests who welcomed the victory of militant atheism in Russia, as preferable to the disappearance of Christianity in the West in the bourgeois spirit to which Western Christianity had given birth. For atheism would only be temporary: "as crucified Christ was resurrected, so Russian Orthodoxy will also be resurrected, and the light from it will regenerate other peoples".[151]

The centralized Soviet State, seeking to overturn the whole world, would be the best possible instrument of God's purpose once the leadership saw the need to embrace Orthodoxy. The leadership would have to do this because of the decline of Communist belief and the need to regenerate Russia to defend herself against China. The Soviet Press should explain that a mistake had been made, and God did, in fact, exist.

> Only Soviet power, having accepted Orthodoxy and revealing in itself the source of the water of life, is capable of BEGINNING THE GREAT TRANSFORMATION OF THE WORLD. And this would happen—all humanity would sigh with the greatest relief and would reach out after our country to a new type of life. [Shimanov's capitals, here and below].[152]

Shimanov criticized Solzhenitsyn for saying that Russia was not yet ready for phenomenon. Equally unacceptable was Solzhenitsyn's belief in a democratic solution to the national question. Solzhenitsyn had said democracy, instead of rejecting democracy as a bourgeois and Protestant

> not a word about the possibility that the Soviet Union is not a mechanical conglomerate of nations, ethnically and religiously homogeneous, which had 'accidentally' fallen into Russia's orbit, but a MYSTICAL ORGANISM, composed of nations mutually complementing each other and, headed by the Russian people, composing a LITTLE MANKIND—a source and spiritual detonator for the larger mankind.[153]

Shimanov nevertheless expressed the view elsewhere that the different nations of the world, including the different nations of the Soviet Union, should not associate unnecessarily with other nations. He was particularly opposed to mixed marriages.[154]

The tones of Russian messianism appeared again in his article "Moscow, the Third Rome". The October Revolution was of universal significance.

> The world needed the death of Russia, in order to be resurrected after her…
>
> Moscow has not ceased to be the Third Rome because in Russia the October Revolution took place. On the contrary, Moscow was preserved as the Third Rome precisely because of the Revolution…
>
> After Great October we must talk about the ORTHODOXIZATION OF THE WHOLE WORLD.[155]

Like the nineteenth-century Slavophils, Shimanov considered that the tsars had prevented the Church from functioning freely and had subordinated it to government interests. Also like the Slavophils, he rejected democracy as "the power of money".[156] The introduction of democracy, or liberalization, in Russia, could let in the real ruler of the liberal-anarchic West—"CAPITAL"—and prevent a religious revival.[157] Liberalism would be particularly disastrous in Russia, because it would unleash extreme nationalism. This would lead to massacres of Russians in the borderlands and retaliatory massacres of non-Russians in the centre, and to the expansion of China. One should proceed not from juridical forms, like the democrats, but from Christianity. In Soviet power, Shimanov saw "THE SECRET MEANING AND HAND OF GOD, leading our people through the greatest fall to the greatest rebirth".[158]

Referring to Uvarov's trilogy, Shimanov said that it was unnecessary to complement Orthodoxy and *narodnost'* with autocracy. He would choose monarchy in preference to the "contemporary Western bourgeois-democratic system", but monarchy in Russia was now impossible. Christians should be loyal to the system as it existed, and try to harmonize relations with the State for the common good. Shimanov's loyalty to the Soviet government is linked with St Paul's view that "All power is from God", but it goes much further.[159] In a 1975 article, "The Ideal State", he explains that the Soviet regime is "pregnant with theocracy" and predicts that the "approaching" transformation of the CPSU into the "Orthodox Party of the Soviet Union" will bring about the "ideal State". This will be a prelude to the creation of the millennial Kingdom.[160]

Shimanov denied suggestions that he was anti-Semitic. "I am against hostility to the Jews as such." He had never called them the enemies of Russia, although many of them "slander the Russian people", while others respect and understand other peoples. He believed in the equality and brotherhood of all nations in God. The Jewish people were perhaps the most unfortunate of all "not owing to suppression by those among whom they lived (this is the favourite theory and almost a poem of all Zionists), but owing to certain internal circumstances, arising because in the past they rejected the Messiah. I recognize that compassion for this people is necessary, but only insofar as it does not threaten the existence of other peoples."[161] In an interview with the Jewish samizdat journal *Evrei v SSSR* (Jews in the USSR), Shimanov tried to explain the social roots of anti-Semitism. He claimed that the tendency of Jews to give each other support was "objectively directed against the people in whose milieu they are living". He called for Jews to be allowed to live together autonomously. The Zionist solution was not likely to be successful because it was rooted in inhumanity towards the Arabs. He also expressed the wish that Jews would become Christian and take part in the theocratic transformation of Russia.[162]

Shimanov explained in his 1976 article "The Basis for Hope" why the Christian transformation of Soviet power was probably inevitable. Although Communism had some religious roots, in the chiliastic teachings of Judaism and Christianity, it grew out of the bourgeois world and had never articulated values which differed in principle from bourgeois values. In the USSR, society was becoming bourgeoisified and Americanized, with people pursuing private consumer and sexual interests, while paying lip service to government policy out of fear. The government would have to find ways of re-creating patriotic enthusiasm and crowding out bourgeois values. Externally, the USSR had faced two defeats: the split with China, which now posed a threat, forcing the Soviet leaders into détente with the West; and the breaking of the Communist parties in the capitalist world with the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The West was trying to fight the spread of Communism by striving for the liberalization of the Soviet regime. Such liberalization, however, would give nothing to the West and would lead to a catastrophe in the Soviet Union and to fatal consequences for the whole world. The West should insist not on liberalization but on

humanization and the liberation of Christianity in the Soviet Union from administrative suffocation. In the long term, this would lead to a Christian rebirth in the Soviet Union, the transformation of the country and a chain reaction around the world. If, however, there was no Christian revival, the Soviet tower would crash down. "Without any war our land to the Urals, if not further, will be coloured yellow, and there will be no way out of the world convulsions."[163]

Shimanov himself acted on his desire for greater freedom for the Orthodox Church. In July 1976 he wrote to Patriarch Pimen, asking him to speak out against State restrictions on the clergy,[164] and in August he sent a letter to Brezhnev against the internment of Aleksandr Argentov of the Christian Seminar (see below) in a psychiatric hospital.[165] In these actions, he was adopting the practice of the human rights movement, despite his view of the Soviet State.

It is possible that Shimanov's views were close to those held in the Brezhnev era by the upper hierarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church, who may have been reconciled to Soviet political and economic structures but wished to influence the authorities to move in a religious direction. While his loyalty and almost idolization of the Soviet State tempt one to assign Shimanov to the camp of the *gosudarstvenniki,* his insistence that the State will have to abandon Marxism-Leninism and accept Christianity before it becomes an instrument of God's will differentiates his position from them. It is difficult to accept his own label of "Slavophil" either, because the nineteenth-century Slavophils never wanted to extend the powers of the State. Shimanov's Russian universalist messianism (Russia will save the world through Orthodoxy) is tempered by a nationalist hostility towards the Jews (albeit denied) and the West.

Dimitry Dudko, the Christian Seminar and the Christian Committee

Unofficial Russian nationalist activity after 1975 was centred on people whose primary concerns were religious. This was connected with the revival of interest in religion, which continued through the Brezhnev era. It is difficult to estimate how much this revival affected the ordinary Russian, outside cultural circles. Reports at the time spoke of 30 to 50 million members of the Russian Orthodox Church, but this may refer simply to the number of people baptized.[166] The existence of a religious revival is attested to by unofficial representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church, such as Levitin-Krasnov, who emphasizes the attraction of Orthodoxy for urban intellectual youth.[167] Mikhail Meerson-Aksyonov sees the religious revival in terms of "the conversion to Christianity of tens of thousands of young people who belong to the second and third generation of Soviet citizens and who have received atheist education".[168]

Some official leaders of the Church under Brezhnev also felt able to comment favourably. Metropolitan Iuvenaly claimed, "What today exists in the Russian Orthodox Church…is a spiritual revival."[169] From about the mid-1970s, the Church hierarchs seemed to display a certain degree of confidence in their

strength. The *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* began to mention favourably ideologists who were hostile to Marxism: the ninteenth-century Slavophils (here it reflected and reinforced trends in the cultural intelligentsia) and even twentieth-century thinkers who had opposed Bolshevism, including *émigrés* like Sergei Bulgakov, and Father Pavel Florensky who died in a Stalinist labour camp.[170] The Party Central Committee seems to have been sufficiently concerned about the Russian Orthodox Church to call for a report from the Council for Religious Affairs. This categorized the bishops in terms of their loyalty to the State.[171]

A major role in the revival was played by Father Dimitry Dudko (see pp. 77, 84, 89, 95–6). Born in 1922 in a poor peasant family in the region of Briansk, he had entered the Novodevichy Monastery seminary in 1945 but had then been sent to the camps. After the XX Congress, he was rehabilitated. In 1958 he was awarded the degree of candidate of theology by the Spiritual Academy for his thesis "The *sobornost'* of the Church". The title evokes Slavophil strivings and, according to Levitin-Krasnov, Dudko belonged to the tradition of theological thought begun by Khomiakov. Levitin-Krasnov reports that Dudko also followed Berdiaev in seeing freedom as the basis of religious life.[172] As priest at St Nicholas' Church in the Cemetery of the Transfiguration in Moscow, he gained popularity and baptized a number of adults into Orthodoxy.[173] In September 1972 he was warned that the authorities wished to remove him, but his parishioners responded to his appeal for support and he was left at his post.[174] His question-and-answer sessions in the winter of 1973–4 attracted many young people to his church. He avoided specific questions of politics and human rights, but demonstrated a religious Russian nationalism. "My patriotism is based on faith," he explained.[175] Like Shimanov, and like the Church hierarchy, he promoted a certain loyalty to the regime. Religion, he said, is "(if it comes to that) a good builder of communism."[176] Futhermore, he preached a pure Russian messianism.

> Now with us in Russia a great miracle is taking place—not only the crucifixion of Christ but also his resurrection from the dead…
>
> …Golgotha isn't simply sufferings, but sufferings which lead to resurrection, and enlighten people…
>
> Golgotha is in Russia, and where Golgotha is, there too is resurrection.[177]

In May 1974 Dudko was removed from his parish, and in September he was appointed to the village of Kabanovo, fifty miles from Moscow. This led to an appeal by his parishioners to Patriarch Pimen, asking that he be returned to them.[178] Muscovites continued to attend his sermons in Kabanovo, and in December 1975 he was dismissed from there as well. This provoked a wave of protests: one from 300 of his parishioners, another from Shafarevich, Vadim Borisov, Feliks Svetov and other Orthodox intellectuals; another from Gleb lakunin and Lev Regelson.[179] In April 1976, he was given a church in the village of Grebnevo,

outside Moscow. Despite continued pressure, he continued to write on the Golgotha theme. His 1977 article, "From the Russian Golgotha", regretted that some people could not hear about Russia calmly: "for them appears at once the Third Rome, Russian nationalism-chauvinism, and most recently National Bolshevism." But "Russia and the Russian person are unthinkable without Christianity." After references to Dostoevsky and Tiutchev, he described Russia as

> a spiritual force, which cannot be destroyed…
>
> [Russia] knows from her own experience how to escape from the misfortune which has hung over the whole world gone mad. Russia is now not only in those territories which the USSR has illegally occupied—she has penetrated everywhere…
>
> Russia is not a question of a particular State, the question of Russia is a world question. On the solution of this problem depends whether or not the world will exist.[180]

In September 1978 he began publishing a newspaper *V svete Preobrazheniia* (*In the Light of the Transfiguration,* subtitled *An Orthodox Weekly Newspaper*). This survived to 1980.[181]

Dudko's influence was present in the Christian Seminar, which was established in Moscow in 1974 and which in 1978 renamed itself the Christian Seminar on Problems of the Religious Renaissance. This group of people, mainly young, discussed Russian Orthodox thinkers of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In a list of subjects discussed in the Seminar between September 1974 and July 1976, the names mentioned most frequently were Vladimir Solovyov (four times) and Khomiakov (three times). The founder of the Seminar was Aleksandr I.Ogorodnikov, who was born in 1950 and converted to Christianity only in 1973. "From Marxist convictions, through nihilism and the complete denial of any ideology, through attraction to the 'hippy' way of life we arrived at the Church," wrote Ogorodnikov in 1976.[182] Elsewhere, he and his co-seminarist Boris Razveev wrote: "Khomyakov, Dostoevsky, V.Solovyov, Fr S. Bulgakov and G.Florovsky brought us up to the threshold of the Church and set us before its doors." The Seminar also discussed aspects of Western religious and political thought, the Russian saints and their relationship to the State, and the sermons of Dudko.[183] The latter considered Ogorodnikov among his spiritual children, and Ogorodnikov called Dudko his spiritual father.[184]

In 1977 the Seminar published a religious and philosophical samizdat journal with the Slavophil-sounding title *Obshchina* (*Commune,,* or *Community*), under Ogorodnikov's editorship. A declaration of the principles of the Seminar was compiled by Ogorodnikov. This called for the right to practise religion and to live according to the Christian conscience, and for the Church to pay attention to the world as well as to heaven. The declaration predicted that the Orthodox

Church would come through its crisis and "affirm itself in its glory through the whole Russian land, also inviting other peoples to the Christian Transfiguration". Towards this end, the Seminar would seek to create a "Christian *obshchina*", develop the Orthodox world-view and theological education, pursue missionary activity and defend religious freedom. On the future of Russia the declaration stated:

> At the centre of the interests of the Seminar stands the question of the history and future fate of Russia and the Russian Orthodox Church. This question cannot be decided without considering the multinational composition of our country.

There followed a reference to the "Russian Golgotha", and a statement that the Seminar was united in "love for Russia as for a mother…brotherly love for Christians of all nationalities…respect for the national dignity of people of different ethnic groups". This was as far as the declaration was prepared to go for the non-Russians. "Holy Rus'", the conclusion added, was "the holy of holies of our national consciousness".[185]

There were several such groups in Moscow and other cities; the Christian Seminar had links with the religious and philosophical seminar in Leningrad, founded by Orthodox believers such as Tatiana Goricheva but not limited to the Orthodox. This group published the journal 37, twenty issues of which appeared between 1975 and 1981, edited by Viktor Krivulin.[186]

According to the Moscow Helsinki Monitoring Group member Liudmila Alekseeva, the "main center" of Russian nationalism from early 1977 was the Christian Committee for the Defence of Believers' Rights in the USSR, founded in December 1976.[187] Two of the three founder members were former *Veche* contributors, Hierodeacon Varsonofy Khaibulin and Viktor Kapitanchuk, although Khaiubulin left the Committee in 1978. The third was lakunin, who continued into the 1970s his campaign of appeals for religious freedom, sometimes together with Lev Regelson.[188] Of particular note was the June 1976 ecumenical appeal to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet for religious freedom, signed by lakunin, Regelson, Shafarevich, Dudko and others—a total of twenty-eight Christians from six denominations.[189]

The Christian Committee confined its membership to Orthodox believers, saying that since the Orthodox Church had been responsible for religious repression for centuries when it was the State Church, the Committee considered it its "special duty to take the initiative in the cause of the defence of the religious freedom of all believers in the country, irrespective of their confession".[190] It produced thousands of pages, documenting the persecution of people of virtually all the Christian denominations in the USSR, and also of the Jew Iosif Begun, who was sentenced for teaching Hebrew. Meerson-Aksyonov claimed that the Committee had the "silent connivance of the Church hierarchy", but this may overestimate its basis of support.[191] It is true, however, that Father

Vasily Fonchenkov, one of the later Committee members, was allowed to continue lecturing at the Moscow Theological Academy for a while after joining the Committee, and that the Committee was never openly attacked by the Patriarchate.[192] Iakunin's report to the Committee, "On the Current Situation of the Russian Orthodox Church and Perspectives for the Religious Rebirth of Russia", highlighted the interest of the intelligentsia and of young people in religion, and the inability of the Patriarchate to meet their needs.[193] Since the activity of the Christian Committee was in the defence of human rights, rather than in the development of Russian messianism, its activity will not be discussed in detail here. In the attachment of its members to Orthodoxy and of at least two of them to Russian nationalism, the Committee can be seen as a reflection of the evolution of the Slavophilism of the 1970s towards the human rights movement.[194]

The activities of the Christian Seminar and the Christian Committee were not ignored by the authorities. Aleksandr Argentov was the first member of the Christian Seminar to suffer persecution: on 14 July 1976 he was confined to a psychiatric hospital in Moscow for a few weeks and given harmful drugs.[195] The newspaper *Literaturnaia gazeta* carried a long attack, over two issues, in April 1977 on Ogorodnikov, Iakunin, Regelson and Dudko.[196] One week after the second part appeared, Iakunin and Dudko fought back with a press conference at Dudko's flat.[197] While some Seminar members were harassed, the authorities allowed the Seminar and the Christian Committee to function. As Jane Ellis has pointed out, from the middle of 1977 to the middle of 1979 the KGB generally left religious cases alone while they dealt with the activists of the Helsinki Monitoring Groups, presumably because they saw the latter cases as more serious.[198] An exception was the Christian Seminar leader Ogorodnikov, arrested on 21 November 1978 and initially sentenced to a year in the camps for "parasitism". Regelson replaced him as leader of the Seminar.[199]

From the middle of 1979 came a crackdown on all forms of dissent. This was initially believed to be connected with the desire of the Soviet leaders to clear Moscow of all dissidents in time for the Olympics, due to be held there in summer 1980. The invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979 was the culmination of the collapse of détente with the West (at least as far as the USA and Britain were concerned, if not yet the rest of Western Europe). This removed the reason for the Soviet leaders not to move against the activists for religious freedom, for fear of alienating Western public opinion. Vladimir Poresh, the Christian Seminar's representative in Leningrad, was arrested on 1 August 1979 for his role in publishing *Obshchina*. He was tried in April 1980 and given five years in a strict regime camp and three years' exile. Ogorodnikov was not released when his year was over but retried in September 1980 for editing *Obshchina,* and sentenced to six years of strict regime camp plus five years' exile. As far as the Christian Committee was concerned, Iakunin was arrested on 1 November 1979 and Regelson on 24 December. Kapitanchuk was left at liberty until 12 March 1980. After his arrest the Committee announced that it was

expanding to include ten anonymous members, but the supply of documents dried up.[200]

Probably the most serious blow to the Orthodox revival, and to Russian messianist thought, was the arrest of Dudko on 15 January 1980 and his "recantation" of his activities on television on 20 June. The recantation was later reprinted in major newspapers. Without in any sense renouncing his Orthodox faith, he said that his struggle against atheism had become a struggle against the Soviet State, and he had become a tool of the West.[201] His apologetic letter to the Patriarch was published in the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*.[202] After his broadcast he was released, but the following month he began to recant his recantation.[203]

The political activity of the Orthodox Church dissidents was now in the doldrums. Regelson, Kapitanchuk and Feliks Karelin gave evidence against Iakunin, who was sentenced in August 1980 to five years' labour camp and the same time in exile. Regelson and Kapitanchuk repented at their trials, in September and October, and were released.[204] One journal which succeeded in appearing twice during the crackdown, in 1980 and 1981, was *Mnogaia leta* (Many Years), edited by Shimanov. In accordance with Shimanov's views, outlined earlier, it argued for closer co-operation between Orthodox people and the State.[205]

The dissident Russian nationalist movement under Brezhnev can be schematically described as passing through three stages. It began with underground organization, represented by VSKhSON; it passed through the stage of programmatic samizdat journals, such as *Veche,* putting forward an ideology (or range of ideologies) which differed from that of the regime, but which claimed loyalty to the Soviet Constitution; and it ended with open human rights activity, exemplified by the participation of Osipov in protests against repression and by the work of Khaibulin and Kapitanchuk in the Christian Committee for the Defence of Believers' Rights. From the point of view of this study, its main contribution was that, for the first time since the Bolshevik victory, Russian messianist ideas linked with Orthodoxy were defended inside the Soviet Union.

8
Andropov and Chernenko against Russian nationalism

The chief ideologist of the Brezhnev era, Suslov, died in January 1982. From May 1982, when lury Vladimirovich Andropov became Central Committee Secretary with responsibilities in the ideological field, it seems that it was his policies which became the official line, rather than those of the ailing Brezhnev. In the period of Andropov's General Secretaryship, from November 1982 to February 1984, Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko was the ideology Secretary, but the public position of the two leaders in relation to Russian nationalism was the same. Chernenko, who succeeded Andropov as General Secretary, appears to have also held the ideology "portfolio" until late 1984, when M.S.Gorbachev took it over. The latter seems to have avoided committing himself on Russian nationalism before becoming General Secretary in March 1985.

Observers as different in their views as Georgy Vladimov and Zhores Medvedev agree that Andropov, at the end of his life at least, was hostile to Russian nationalism.[1] The fact that Andropov was keen to stamp out Russian nationalism, and that he was not merely allowing Chernenko to pursue his own ideological interests, is suggested by his use of the KGB, still under his control, against it. Indeed he is said to have described Russian nationalism as the "main concern".[2] One may surmise that Andropov, as former head of the KGB—which put many more non-Russians than Russians in labour camps for political dissent—was aware of the ill-feelings among Soviet minorities caused by the expression of Russian nationalism.

The dissidents

In 1981–3 the KGB moved to mop up most of the dissident Russian nationalists. In August 1982 Zoia A.Krakhmalnikova, editor of the Orthodox samizdat journal Nadezhda *(Hope),* whose nationalist overtones were very mild, and which reportedly had the backing of the Church hierarchy, was arrested; she was later given a relatively light sentence.[3] Of wider significance to the nationalist movement was the arrest of Ivanov-Skuratov in August 1981. In connection with this case, not only dissidents such as Borodin but also the establishment figures Glazunov and Semanov were questioned.[4] The trial in June 1982 revealed that

Ivanov-Skuratov's work had been produced on the typewriters of the General Staff.[5] Ivanov-Skuratov "confessed" to anti-Soviet agitation and was given a light sentence. A report circulated in late 1982 that Semanov had been arrested, but this was later refuted.[6] In May 1983, the purge climaxed with the trial of Borodin on charges which covered the whole of his samizdat activity and sending his literary works abroad.[7] He had refused to co-operate with the Ivanov-Skuratov investigation; the KGB wanted him to denounce Soviet intellectuals whom he knew, such as Soloukhin and Rasputin. As a result he was sentenced to a harsh 10 years in a labour camp and 5 years' internal exile.[8] Further repressive measures included the re-sentencing within the camps of members of the Christian Seminar when they were due to be released, a process already applied to Ogorodnikov.[9] The effect of these policies was to diminish but not totally eliminate the volume of Russian nationalist activity.

The literary struggle

Suslov was barely buried before *Pravda* carried an attack by Vasily I.Kuleshov, head of Russian Literature at Moscow University, on a number of critics for their uncritical attitude to Dostoevsky.[10] The year 1981 had seen a spate of articles marking the 160th anniversary of the author's birth.[11] The *gosudarstvennik* lury Seleznyov published two admiring studies of Dostoevsky, in 1980 and 1981.[12] The Mo*lodaia gvardiia cri*tic Mikhail Lobanov, reviewing the earlier study in *Oktiabr',* attributed the world significance of Dostoevsky to his position in the struggle of good and evil, and to the role of the Russian people in world history, "beginning with the October Revolution". Welcoming Seleznyov's work, he said that it showed the existence of "healthy forces" in literary criticism and in the wider social consciousness.[13]

Kuleshov's principal target was not Lobanov but another *gosudarstvennik,* Kozhinov, for a November 1981 article in *Nash sovremennik* dedicated to Dostoevsky's anniversary. Kozhinov had claimed the existence of a "Russian idea", which he traced from Metropolitan Ilarion's sermon "On Law and Grace" in the eleventh century through Filofei, Pushkin, Belinsky, Chaadaev, Ivan Kireevsky, Herzen, Gogol and Tolstoy to Dostoevsky's "Pushkin speech".[14] (He did not mention Berdiaev.) Kozhinov emphasized the uniqueness *(svoeobrazie)* of Russian thought: its ability to understand and absorb the thought of other nations. He claimed that nobody, since the "Pushkin speech", had disputed Dostoevsky's idea that "the Russian soul, the genius of the Russian people, is perhaps the most able of all peoples to contain within itself the idea of pan-human unity".[15] Among Dostoevsky's predecessors, Belinsky had wondered whether the Russian talent for receiving the fruits of other cultures was not a sign of superiority but rather the result of Russia's own lack of culture. Chaadaev had progressed from this to believe in Russia's "ecumenical mission".[16] The striving for universalism, according to Kozhinov, could be achieved only through the nation and was opposed to "cosmopolitanism": the basic direction of Russian

literature (with Dostoevsky representing the apogee) "always preserved the unity of pan-humanity *[vsechelovechesnost']* and *narodnost"'*.[17]

Kuleshov complained that Kozhinov had presented a string of writers, both supporters and opponents of tsarism, as if they were all co-thinkers of Dostoevsky. He was particularly upset by Kozhinov's view of Kulikovo.[18] Kozhinov depicted this not as a battle of Russia against the Tatar-Mongol conquerors, but as "the multinational Russian State" against the "aggressive cosmopolitan armada".[19] It is also noteworthy that, with the help of long quotations from Lenin, Kozhinov emphasized Russia's role in Asia, which Dostoevsky had foreseen.[20] It seems likely that this was linked with Soviet involvement in Afghanistan. A disciple of Kozhinov, and proponent of a "new messianism", was the poet lury Kuznetsov. He wrote a poem, apparently dedicated to Kozhinov, after the invasion of Afghanistan, depicting Russia "turning her back on the West". Kuznetsov made no secret of his indifference to socialism.[21]

In 1981 and 1982 a number of attacks were made on Soloukhin. The journal *Nash sovremennik,* in one of a series of collections of short essays by Soloukhin, published in March 1981 the following statement by him. "In the twentieth century, for every healthily-thinking person there are no doubts that in the world, in the Universe, in the variety of life there is a higher rational source *[vysshee razumnoe nachalo]*"[22] This suggestion of the existence of a Supreme Being led *Kommunist* in January 1982 to criticize the passage and accuse him of "god-building".[23] In April (after Suslov's death), *Nash sovremennik* suffered changes in its editorial board, including the removal of the deputy editor, Seleznyov. *Kommunist* in May carried a letter from *Nash sovremennik,* recognizing the justice of the criticism of Soloukhin's article. It also carried a letter from the Party secretary of the Moscow Writers' Organization, reporting that Soloukhin had assured the Party bureau that he "was and remains a convinced atheist".[24] The October issue of *Nash sovremennik* reprinted the first letter but not the second.[25] The case of Soloukhin, together with *Pravda's* attack on Kozhinov, suggests that Suslov's death may have cleared the way for attempts to re-assert the "class approach" in literature and history. It might be more accurate, on the other hand, to link these attacks with the growing influence of Andropov, and thus only indirectly with Suslov's death. *Nash sovremennik* sought to adapt to the Andropov style by introducing into its pages a section called "Discipline, order, consciousness".

Ideology and the leadership

Opposition to Russian nationalism was evident from statements by the leadership. In July 1982 the Central Committee adopted a decree "On the creative links of the literary and belletristic journals with the practice of communist construction". The decree made some concessions to the *derevenshchiki* by inviting writers to encourage "love for the land, nature and agricultural labour".

But "some journals" were scolded for portraying "events in the history of the fatherland *[otechestva]*, the socialist revolution and collectivization" in a distorted way, and for failing to evaluate social phenomena "from clear class positions".[26] This was an attack on *Nash sovremennik* and other journals for idealizing the tsarist past and expressing doubts about the new order in peasant life. In December 1982, the pro-nationalist E.M.Tiazhelnikov was demoted and replaced as head of the Propaganda Department by Boris Stukalin.[27] This was immediately after a strongly nationalist article by Proskurin on the uniqueness of Russia appeared in *Pravda*.[28]

Andropov's increasing influence in 1982 coincided with the assertion, albeit temporary, of a more traditional Leninist line in discussing the future of the nationalities. The speech by Andropov, by then General Secretary, on the sixtieth anniversary of the USSR in December 1982, seemed at first to mark the full rehabilitation of the concept of *sliianie* (see Chapter 4). Andropov said:

> Our final goal is clear. It is, to use V.I.Lenin's words, 'not only the *sblizhenie* [coming together] of nations, but also their *sliianie* [fusion]'. The Party well understands that the path to this goal is long. Here it is impossible in any event either to run ahead or to allow any holding back of processes that have already matured.

Nationality problems would survive "while nations exist, while there are national distinctions. And they will exist for a long time, much longer than class distinctions."[29]

Progress had led to growing national consciousness, said Andropov, but this should not lead to national arrogance, conceit or disrespect for other nationalities. The continued existence of these was due not only to throwbacks from capitalism but also to mistakes of the present. All the nationalities in a republic should receive their due representation in Party and State bodies. While praising the Russian people (in a low key), Andropov called for tact and attention to be paid to questions of language, historical monuments, historiography and the allocation of cadres, in order to promote internationalism.[30] Addressing the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet in January 1983, Andropov urged that more attention be given to the specific needs of all the nationalities, "especially the small peoples".[31]

Thus Andropov combined *sliianie* with expressions of concern for national rights. Chernenko made a passing reference to *sliianie* in December 1982.[32] After this, it appears that no Politburo member or republican leader mentioned it. It seems likely that both Andropov and Chernenko, whatever their other differences, were united in reasserting the importance of ideology, in reaction to the cynicism of the later Brezhnev years. In June 1983 the Central Committee held a Plenum specifically devoted to ideology, where Andropov and Chernenko both used *sblizhenie*. Chernenko made the major speech as ideology Secretary. The only political trend in literature that he attacked was Russian nationalism. "It

is disturbing that in certain works deviations from historical truth are allowed—in the evaluation of collectivization, for example—and that 'god-seeking' motifs and idealization of the patriarchal order creep into them."[33]

Later that year A.N.Iakovlev, who a decade earlier had paid with his job for making similar criticisms, was brought back from Canada to head the prestigious Institute of the World Economy and International Relations. During his General Secretaryship, Chernenko made no innovations or major statements in relation to Russian nationalism, but emphasized ideological orthodoxy. In his address to the Union of Writers in September 1984, he insisted that literature serve the needs of the Party and follow "socialist realism". He called for more attention to the "military-patriotic theme".[34] In this stifling atmosphere, two leading Russian nationalists decided not to return to the USSR after visits abroad: lury Liubimov, director of Moscow's Taganka theatre, offered his resignation in September 1983, and was replaced in March 1984 by Efros; and Andrei Tarkovsky, director of the film *Andrei Rublev,* chose to stay in the West in July 1984.[35]

9
Gorbachev and the end of empire

This chapter will show how representatives of the tendencies in nationalist thought discussed previously came to play an important role in the struggle for the future orientation of the Soviet Union and ultimately for its very survival. The process begun by Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev after becoming General Secretary in March 1985 led to the destruction of the Communist State and to the end of the Soviet empire.

The initial contribution of Gorbachev to the development of Russian messianism was his inauguration of the policy of *glasnost'*. Normally translated as "openness", its practical application was the gradual elimination of a series of taboos affecting literary and public activity. Emerging in 1985, with criticisms of the latter Brezhnev period as the "stagnation period", *glasnost'* gathered strength following the January 1987 Central Committee Plenum and promoted *perestroika,* the "restructuring" of the economic and political system. The partial democratization of the political system, exemplified by the **XIX** Party Conference (June 1988), elections to the USSR Congress of Peoples' Deputies (CPD) (March 1989) and the first meeting of the CPD (May-June 1989), led to a transformation of the political and cultural atmosphere throughout the Soviet Union. There was an explosion in the quantity of interesting political, historical and cultural articles in the official periodical press. Unofficial "informal groups" with their own programmes and publications mushroomed from the Baltic to the Pacific. Ideas formerly confined to samizdat erupted into the official journals and on to the agenda of the Politburo. To analyse the flow of new material on Russian messianism would require another book.[1]

A precondition for the success of Gorbachev's proposed economic reforms was a transformation of the Soviet Union's relations with the West, leading to a major shift of resources from defence to the civilian economy. In place of the class struggle in international relations, Gorbachev advocated universal human values and interdependence. One necessary step in this direction was to end the war in Afghanistan, which had damaged the USSR diplomatically, economically and socially. Brezhnev had justified the Soviet action to the **XXVI** Party Congress in 1981, first, in terms of the world-historical movement towards communism and the reaction of the bourgeoisie. "Imperialism launched a real

undeclared war against the Afghan revolution." But he then added a defensive justification, from the point of view of the interests of the Soviet State. "This also created a direct threat to the security of our southern border".[2]

Among the *gosudarstvenniki,* however, the invasion was seen in quite a different light. A leading representative was the writer Aleksandr Prokhanov, who published two full-page articles in *Literaturnaia gazeta* in 1985.[3] He referred not to the spread of socialism, but to the "eternal great-power cause" *(vekovechnoe derzhavnoe delo)*[4] As Kozhinov had been hinting in 1981 (see Chapter 8), the Soviet troops in Afghanistan were advancing the age-old interests of the Russian State. The war was seen in positive terms: for the first time since 1945, Soviet soldiers were being given combat experience. According to the samizdat writer Sergei Khovansky, Prokhanov was close to "former leaders of the country and…influential people within the military". Khovansky described the position of this group as "war is better than peace".[5] The continuing strength of nationalist ideas within the military was borne out by an article in the MPA journal *Kommunist vooruzhennykh sil* in 1985, which listed the successes of the Russian armed forces over eight centuries.[6] Prokhanov in his second article specifically attacked the *derevenshchiki* for their concern with eternal and absolute morality. Further, Afghanistan had brought out "individual self-sacrifice and renunciation of personal welfare in favour of the State". For Prokhanov, the time of détente had passed. In its place had come the "idea of calamity, of a storm, of impending catastrophe; it prompts us to reread the Apocalypse."[7] The *gosudarstvenniki* were to be a major obstacle to Gorbachev's Western orientation.

The beginnings of *glasnost'*

Some early moves of the new leadership suggested an inclination towards meeting some of the grievances of the Russian nationalists, especially the *vozrozhdentsy*. In his stern measures against alcohol, Gorbachev took up one of their particular concerns.[8] The driving force of the campaign may well have been the Politburo member and ideology Secretary, Egor K.Ligachev, who showed sympathy for conservative Russian nationalists. Alcohol was portrayed as a non-Russian vice introduced by foreigners.[9] Valentin Rasputin's short story "Pozhar" ("The Fire"), published in *Nash sovremennik* in July 1985, was a well-timed portrayal of the consequences of drunkenness in the villages.[10] The campaign was unpopular with much of society, and was partly circumvented by an expansion of illegal home-brewing, while the General Secretary earned the epithet *"General'nyi mineral'nyi"*.

Kommunist in July 1985 included a discussion of the ancient Russian manuscript, the "Lay of the Host of Igor". In this, Academician Likhachev emphasized that the three Eastern Slav peoples, Russians, Ukrainians and Belorussians, had a "common mother" in ancient Rus'.[11] In 1986 Likhachev was named head of the newly-formed Cultural Foundation of the USSR. This

prestigious body, intended to preserve the cultural heritage of the peoples of the Soviet Union, included among the members of its board Metropolitan Pitirim of Volokolamsk and Iuriev, the head of the publishing department of the Moscow Patriarchate, and Raisa Gorbacheva, the wife of the General Secretary.

A considerable victory for the Russian nationalists, and especially the *vozrozhdentsy,* was the decision not to proceed with the plan to reverse part of the flow of the Ob and Irtysh rivers in Siberia. This scheme would have brought much-needed irrigation water to Central Asia. Opposition to this project had been a major issue among *derevenshchiki* such as Rasputin and Sergei Zalygin, the journal *Sever* and Academician Likhachev.[12] Supporters claimed that the project was essential for the burgeoning, traditionally Islamic, Central Asian population. On the other hand, Russian ecologists worried about the effects of the diversion of water on the temperature in the Arctic Ocean and thence the climate in the northern hemisphere. Rasputin expressed the fear that the withdrawal of water would adversely affect soil fertility in Russia and destroy the Russian North.[13] In January 1986 *Kommunist* published an article, co-authored by Likhachev, on the need to preserve the North as a monument of Russian culture.[14] The project allowed the *vozrozhdentsy* to focus on their traditional concerns: the defence of the Russian land, the Russian village, historical monuments, the world environment, as well as the threat to smaller Soviet nationalities such as the Komi (allegedly threatened by the scheme) for whose fate they considered the Russian people responsible. They counterposed ethics to the unbridled worship of technology.

If it had appeared that vital Russian interests were being sacrificed for the Central Asians, there could have been a strong Russian nationalist backlash. But the guidelines for the development of the Soviet economy up to the year 2000, adopted at the XXVII Party Congress in March 1986, made no mention of the diversion project. Instead there appeared the injunction "Use water resources more rationally".[15] Belov and Rasputin nevertheless complained at the USSR Writers' Union Congress in June 1986 that work was still going ahead, and the liberal Andrei Voznesensky added his voice to the opponents of the scheme.[16] It was confirmed after a Politburo meeting in August 1986, however, that the project had been abandoned.[17] Nevertheless, a year later the Uzbek Press again began to argue for the project, apparently with the backing of the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources. The topic remained live. Under the impact of the Chernobyl disaster of April 1986, public opinion throughout the USSR became more sensitive to environmental issues and less willing to allow interference with nature.

The appointment of A.N.Iakovlev as head of the Propaganda Department, and then, at the XXVII Congress, to the Central Committee Secretariat, appeared at first to be bad news for the nationalists, in view of his earlier opposition to them. By the time Iakovlev had been promoted to be a full Politburo member in 1987, it had become clear that he was a leading ally of Gorbachev in the battle for *glasnost'*. Whatever was Iakovlev's personal position on nationalism, his stance

on *glasnost'* allowed both "Westernizers" and nationally-minded people to put forward their ideas. The new edition of the Party Programme, adopted at the XXVII Congress, avoided any nationalist references to the "great Russian people".[18] In his report to the Congress, Gorbachev spoke against attempts being undertaken "in certain works of literature and art and scholarly works…to present in idyllic tones reactionary-nationalist and religious survivals, contradicting our ideology, the socialist way of life and the scientific world-view *(Applause)"*[19] This was clearly aimed at both Russian and non-Russian nationalism. On the other hand, the appointment in August 1986 of Zalygin to be editor of *Novyi mir* in succession to the liberal former political prisoner Vladimir Karpov, who had been appointed First Secretary of the USSR Writers' Union, represented a victory for the *vozrozhdentsy*.

As *glasnost'* developed, unofficial political activity began to revive, after the repressive climate of the first half of the decade. The Russian nationalist group which attracted the most attention in the late 1980s, in both the Western and the Soviet media, was Pamiat' (Memory). This was founded in Moscow in 1980 (originally by staff of the Ministry of the Aviation Industry) with the aim of campaigning to preserve historical monuments. The group attracted support, but fell into the hands of people whose chief concern was not conservation but the "international conspiracy" by Zionists and Masons which, they claimed, was threatening Russia. The key organizer and ideologist was Dmitry D.Vasilev, a photographer, while the head of the Council was Kim Andreev, who was a CPSU member. Others involved included veterans of the official anti-Zionist campaign of the Brezhnev period. From late 1985, the group had regular public meetings in Moscow, Leningrad and Novosibirsk. In a hysterical atmosphere, the leaders read the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" and denounced not only the "Masons" and "Satanists", but also more liberal Russian nationalists such as Likhachev and Glazunov. The documents of Pamiat' also talk hysterically about plots, all the while (like everyone else) claiming to support Gorbachev and *perestroika.*[20] An appeal of 8 December 1987, headed "Patriots of the world, unite!", declared:

> In our country these days the activity of *enemies* is becoming more obvious. They are entrenching themselves in all the sections of the PARTY, the leading force of the USSR. Dark elements in it, speculating with Party slogans and Party phraseology, are in practice carrying out a struggle with *the indigenous population of the country, and annihilating the national face of the peoples.* They are reanimating Trotskyism, in order to discredit socialism, in order to sow chaos in the State, in order to open the sluices to Western capital and Western ideology.[21]

In particular it attacked Iakovlev, accusing him of Russophobia and of perse¬ cuting Pamiat'. Seeking the support of Orthodox Christians, it demanded "full freedom of conscience for believers"; promoting a peace-loving image, it called for an end to "the criminal war in Afghanistan".[22]

The Moscow section of VOOPIiK fell under the control of Pamiat' in April 1987. The following month, Pamiat' organized a series of demonstrations in Moscow and was allowed a meeting with Boris N.Eltsin, at that time a candidate member of the Politburo and First Secretary of the Moscow City Committee of the Party. From that time, the main Soviet newspapers and Central Television regularly denounced Pamiat', comparing its leaders to the Black Hundreds and the Nazis. Readers' letters and journalists asked why the law was not being invoked against them for stirring up racial hatred.[23] One article mentioned that V.N.Emelianov, a *Pamiat'* activist, had murdered his wife.[24] The Komsomol journal *Sobesednik* in June 1989 opened its pages to allow a Pamiat' representative to denounce Zionism, the Masons and the "enemy within the State". He denied that Pamiat' was anti-Semitic, or that they believed that the Russians were the chosen people. He did, however, quote a statement by Gorbachev to the effect that Soviet Jews—officially 0.69% of the population—represented 10 to 20 per cent of people in culture and administration. He denounced this overrepresentation and went on to refer to the activities of several Old Bolsheviks of Jewish origin as "criminal".[25]

How did the Russian nationalist dissidents, who had been imprisoned under Brezhnev and Andropov, fare under Gorbachev? In 1986 Oleg Volkov (see p. 77) circulated a samizdat document, "Notes on *glasnost*'". In this he asked the new leadership to demonstrate the break from past practices by releasing the dissidents, and he mentioned in particular Borodin.[26] From the beginning of 1987, the authorities gradually released virtually all the dissidents (of all shades of opinion) who had earlier been imprisoned for political reasons. Poresh had been released early, in February 1986; Ogorodnikov was freed in February 1987, lakunin in March and Borodin in June.[27] Many former prisoners resumed their political and cultural activity. Ogorodnikov, for example, published the *Biulleten' khristianskoi obshchestvennosti (Christian Community Bulletin)* from July 1987.[28] Meanwhile Ogurtsov, the former leader of VSKhSON, emigrated in November 1987.[29] Dudko issued a statement regretting his recantation of 1980.[30]

Osipov had completed his sentence in 1983 but had been prevented from resuming his public activity. In August 1987 he was able to circulate a samizdat article on *perestroika*. He attacked what he considered the monopolization of the press by what he called the "Evtushenko" tendency. He defended Pamiat', saying that the group had never attacked the Jewish nation.[31] Towards the end of 1987 he brought out the third issue of his samizdat journal, *Zemlia*.[32] On 17 December 1988 he was chosen leader of the Council of the "Christian Patriotic Union" *(Khristianskii patrioticheskii soiuz)* at its founding congress. This group seems to have grown out of the "Initiative Group for the Spiritual and Biological Salvation of the People", created in July 1988; *Zemlia* served as the journal of the latter, and then of the Christian Patriotic Union. The Union also published a monthly information bulletin, *Russkii vestnik (Russian Herald)*.[33]

In 1987 a major Russian Orthodox patriotic 'thick journal', *Vybor(The Choice)*, was founded by Viktor Aksiuchits and Gleb Anishchenko. Aksiuchits

himself contributed to the third issue his article "The Russian Idea", which includes an analysis of Russian messianism:

> The uniqueness of Russian patriotism is in the realization by the people of the unity of its land, the unity of the nation even in spite of the shattering of the State. It was not the State which united the people, but the religious-messianic idea.[34]

Aksiuchits saw the way out of the clash between the two chosen peoples, the Jews and the Russians, in the "return" of both peoples to Christ.[35].

Other Russian nationalist dissidents succeeded in getting heard in the official media. In May 1988 *Literaturnaia Rossiia* published a story by Borodin about Lake Baikal.[36] The journal *Iskusstvo kino (Cinema Art)* conducted in June 1988 a questionnaire which brought into the official press the samizdat debates of the early 1970s, with some of the same participants. The first question began: "What, in your view, are the sources of the Russian messianic idea?"[37] Shafarevich, who appeared quite frequently in the media, denied that the Russians had ever had the consciousness of being the chosen people in the sense that the Jews had. He described Berdiaev's ideas as "dilettante".[38] (Palievsky (see p. 78) in the same debate flatly denied the existence of Russian messianism.[39]) On the other hand, Pomerants (see Chapter 7) provided a sociological explanation of the phenomenon of Russian messianism. He added that the writings of Belov (see p. 121) revealed a "fantastic ideology" and were "symptoms of illness."[40]

In 1989 *Nash sovremennik* published a shortened version of a long article by Shafarevich, entitled "Rusofobiia" ("Russophobia"). This accused liberal samizdat and *émigré* writers, including Amalrik, Pomerants, Levitin-Krasnov and (in particular) Ianov, of "Russophobia" for their concern about the danger of Russian messianism. He praised the *Vekhi* authors and made no concessions to Marxism.[41] The ideas of Solzhenitsyn began to be discussed; in February 1989 the journal of the Soviet Peace Committee, *Vek XX i mir (Twentieth Century and Peace)* published his "Do Not Live by the Lie!"[42]; and in July 1989 *Novyi mir* announced that it would be publishing Solzhenitsyn's works, starting, in accordance with the author's wishes, with *The Gulag Archipelago*.[43]

Gorbachev found both allies and opponents among the Russian nationalists. Broadly speaking, the *gosudarstvenniki* were hostile and the *vozrozhdentsy* sympathetic. *Novyi mir* under Zalygin became the flagship of the *pro-perestroika* liberal nationalists; other leading representatives on this side included Likhachev and the head of the Filmworkers' Union, Elem Klimov. The key organizer among the *anti-perestroika* conservative Russian nationalists appears to have been the writer Iury Bondarev, a member of the Bureau of the USSR Writers' Union, deputy head of the RSFSR Writers' Union and a member of the *Nash sovremennik* editorial board. The group also included Proskurin, head of the RSFSR Cultural Foundation, and Mikhail Alekseev and Anatoly Ivanov, editors-

in-chief of *Moskva* and *Molodaia gvardiia* respectively. John Dunlop has identified a "centrist" group of nationalists between the two poles, including Belov, Rasputin, Soloukhin, Kozhinov and Glazunov.[44] At least some of Dunlop's centrists, however, have conservative tendencies. In January 1989, Belov and Rasputin joined Proskurin and Alekseev, together with the editor of *Nash sovremennik*) Vikulov, and the conservative film-maker, Sergei Bondarchuk, in a joint letter to *Pravda* attacking *Ogonek*. Bondarev himself did not sign the letter: one of *Ogonek's* alleged sins had been to publish an attack on him.[45] After Vitaly Korotich became editor-in-chief of *Ogonek* in 1986 it became a pacemaker for *perestroika,* and as such was regularly attacked by the conservative nationalists, especially in *Nash sovremennik*. Kozhinov's article in that journal in January 1989, for example, was directed primarily against Korotich.[46]

In this wide-ranging, programmatic article, Kozhinov claimed that *Nash sovremennik* had inherited at least part of the mantle of Tvardovsky's *Novyi mir,* in terms of the writers who had migrated from one to the other. Kozhinov was trying to argue that the letter of the eleven to *Ogonek* in 1969 about *Novyi mir* (see p. 72) was not in fact directed against Tvardovsky—a rather difficult task. It was noteworthy that three of the signatories to the 1989 letter about *Ogonek*—Alekseev, Vikulov and Proskurin—were among the signatories of the 1969 letter about *Novyi mir*. Kozhinov's article reflected the same concern as the 1969 letter: the threat to Russian traditions from the bourgeois West. He asserted that Lenin was unlike the other Bolshevik leaders in seeing the need to preserve prerevolutionary Russian culture. Bukharin, who was now idealized by the contemporary Westernizers, had been as bad as Stalin and Trotsky in his desire to root out the old traditions. Kozhinov was concerned primarily with culture; but his view also related to economics. The *perestroika* radicals, such as Nikolai Shmelyov, Gavriil Popov and Leonid Abalkin argued in varying degrees for the introduction of market forces into the Soviet economy. Kozhinov argued that the solution to Russia's problems could be found not by imitating Western models but by looking back into her collectivist traditions.[47] The argument had been made at length by Mikhail Antonov, the ex-Fetisovite and author of the *Veche* article which sought to combine Leninism and Slavophilism. In a July 1986 *Nash sovremennik* article, he argued against "cosmopolitan" attempts to import the methods of unemployment and "hedonism" (consumerism) from the West. Citing Ilarion, Likhachev and the *derevenshchiki*—as well as Marx—he called for a moral and patriotic approach to applying the "human factor" to improve the economy.[48] Unlike Kozhinov and Antonov, Soloukhin in the era of *glasnost'* saw no need to pay lip service to Lenin. He declared that he had refused to sign an appeal of the Memorial Society (led by *pro-perestroika* radicals) concerning the victims of Stalinist repression, because it ignored the atrocities of the Civil War.[49]

What were the links between three distinct groups: the conservatives in the political leadership, the conservative Russian nationalists in literature, and

Pamiat? Belov's popular novel *Vse vperedi (Everything is Ahead)* published in *Nash sovremennik* in 1986 depicted contemporary Russia as the victim of a Zionist-Masonic conspiracy.[50] The same theme was in the background to his latest novel on collectivization, published in *Novyi* mir in March 1989.[51] Following this, he was challenged by Igor Vinogradov in the radical *pro-perestroika* newspaper *Moscow News* to say whether he really believed in this conspiracy.[52] Valentin Rasputin has been one of the few public figures to defend Pamiat'; without supporting their whole philosophy, he noted their (supposed) concern for history and culture and asked that they be given the right to speak in the press.[53] Kozhinov, like Pamiat', Shimanov and, for that matter, Dostoevsky, denies charges of anti-Semitism; but, like them, he proceeds to complain about the privileged position of the Jews. In his January 1989 *Nash sovremennik* article, he cited Gorbachev's statement about Jewish participation in Soviet life (see p. 119) and complained about the "sharp violation of proportionality in relation to other nations".[54] Apart from a similarity of views between Pamiat' and some literary nationalists, there is other evidence of joint activity. Evtushenko has described a meeting held in Moscow on 23 January 1989, organized by the journals *Moskva, Molodaia gvardiia* and *Roman-gazeta,* where the speakers incited anti-Semitism and Pamiat' banners decorated the hall.[55]

As far as the political leadership is concerned, nobody defended Pamiat'; the Politburo member Ligachev, Gorbachev's leading conservative critic, was, however, associated with the more conservative Russian nationalist writers. He is also widely believed to have been behind the Stalinist and anti-Semitic article published in *Sovetskaia Rossiia* on 13 March 1988 over the name of Nina Andreeva.[56]

The growth of nationality tensions

Solzhenitsyn's fears that the process of democratization in the Soviet Union would lead to the growth of tension between nationalities (see p. 99) were shown to be justified in the period of *glasnost'*. Nationalist anger appeared in Kazakhstan in December 1986, following the sacking for corruption of Kunaev as First Secretary and his replacement by a Russian. Through 1987, from Ukraine to Uzbekistan demands grew for the greater use of the native language, while demonstrators in the Baltic republics began to demand secession from the Soviet Union. In 1988 tension between Armenia and Azerbaijan over the future of Nagorny Karabakh escalated to the point of an undeclared war. Popular Fronts appeared in the Baltic republics with mass support. Their demands included controls on immigration and the granting to the native language in each republic the status of being the sole official language. The year 1989 saw clashes over nationality issues resulting in a number of deaths in Georgia, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan. The Popular Fronts in the Baltic won the majority of seats to the CPD and proceeded to escalate their demands. The growth of nationality unrest threatened Gorbachev's whole programme of *perestroika*. It allowed

conservative elements in the leadership, such as Ligachev, to argue that *glasnost'* had gone too far.

The growth of non-Russian nationalism gave impetus to Russian national awareness. In late 1988 conservative Russian nationalists began a campaign to promote the pride of the Russians in their history and their State. The "Association of Russian Artists *[russkikh khudozhnikov]*", formed in November 1988, included Rasputin, Belov, Bondarev, Loshchits, Lobanov, Kozhinov, Ivanov and Vikulov. The Association's declaration expressed alarm at the threat posed by non-Russian nationalism. The danger (it said) was aggravated by the degeneration of the Russian people, for which it blamed official policy. It continued:

> The command methods used by the leadership in the sphere of nationality relations [have] led to a situation in which it has become common to identify the will of the administrative bureaucratic apparatus with the views of the Russian people, whereas it is precisely Russia that is in the most critical position, close to collapse. And the collapse of Russia will inevitably lead to the loss of the unity of the political and state system of the whole country.[57]

In this version of Russian messianism, Russia has suffered the most, and only she can now save the Soviet Union from catastrophe by a national moral regeneration.

Three more organizations were established in March 1989. In Moscow, the "Otechestvo" ("Fatherland") Society was set up, with the involvement of *Moskva, Nash sovremennik* and *Molodaia guardiia*.[58] A Federation for Slavonic Writing and Slavonic Cultures was established, based on official cultural bodies and involving Ukrainians and Belorussians as well as Russians.[59] The "Union for the Spiritual Revival of the Fatherland" was formed with the participation of Russian nationalist groups from different parts of the Soviet Union. *Molodaia gvardiia* was among the sponsoring organizations; Metropolitan Pitirim was elected to the Council, indicating the tacit approval of the Moscow Patriarchate; and Mikhail Antonov was chosen to chair the group.[60] It seemed that, in public view, there was arising a network of intellectuals who, while claiming to support *perestroika,* were really driven by other ideals.

Valentin Rasputin articulated these ideals and feelings in his address to the CPD in May-June 1989. The speech showed several similarities with Solzhenitsyn's *Letter to Ike Soviet Leaders*. It expressed concern for morality and for the environment. The main difference was that it was delivered after the emergence into the open of nationality tensions.

> Russophobia has spread in the Baltic and in Georgia, and it is penetrating into the other republics, to some less, to others more, but it is notable almost everywhere. Anti-Soviet slogans are joined with anti-Russian ones,

> and emissaries from Lithuania and Estonia travel with them, creating a united front, to Georgia, and from there local agitators are sent to Armenia and Azerbaijan.

In injured tones, he went on to suggest to the non-Russian nationalists: "perhaps Russia should leave the [Soviet] Union, if despite all her misfortunes you accuse her, and if her weak development and clumsiness burden your progressive strivings?" Rasputin added that this would allow Russia to preserve her own resources, regain national awareness, have her own Academy of Sciences which would reflect Russian *[rossiiskim]* interests, and restore morality.[61] Aware of Rasputin's popularity, Gorbachev recruited him to his Presidential Council when this was established in March 1990.

In 1988 and 1989, the Popular Fronts in the Baltic republics and Moldavia succeeded to some extent in persuading their governments to introduce legislation to remedy national grievances. Part of the Russian-speaking population of the republics responded by forming "internationalist" movements to resist what were seen as attacks on their own rights. Undoubtedly *anti-perestroika* forces within the central Party and State apparatus or the security forces were stirring up the local Russians and trying to create a backlash. Strikes occurred in Estonia in July 1989 over proposals to restrict political rights for immigrants from outside Estonia. Iury Rudiak, a leader of the (predominantly Russian) Interdvizhenie (Internationalist Movement) in Estonia was reported by *Moscow News* as saying:

> We are extremely worried about the growth of nationalist and separatist forces supported by the leadership of the Republic. By setting the peoples of the Soviet Union against each other and lashing out against the Russian people [,] who are accused of all the sins of Stalinism and the stagnation era, they are altering the direction of perestroika from building up real socialism to restoring the bourgeois system.[62]

Within Russia itself, pressures for power to be devolved from the USSR to the RSFSR began to penetrate political circles. In July 1989 the Prime Minister of the Russian Federation, candidate Politburo member A.V.Vlasov, told the Russian Supreme Soviet of plans to increase the sovereignty of the republic by creating new bodies which existed at the All-Union level but not yet at the republican level. He mentioned ministries, social institutions and a Russian Academy of Sciences, as well as a new television channel.[63] In August 1989 the Leningrad *oblast'* party conference took this direction to a logical conclusion and proposed the establishment of a republican party for the RSFSR, with elective leading bodies.[64] This proposal was resisted by Gorbachev, who saw that such a body would become a powerful centre for conservative resistance within the Party. His fears were justified. Gorbachev was forced to give way and in summer

1990 the new Communist Party of the RSFSR was established with a conservative leadership, and given control of the newspaper *Sovetskaia Rossiia*.

In response to the growing ethnic tension, Gorbachev's strategy seems to have been to show a readiness to make concessions, promising to respect the national cultures and give more independence to the republics. While repeatedly invoking the name of Lenin in relation to the nationality question, he effectively repudiated Lenin's idea of *sliianie* in January 1989. "We of course cannot permit even the smallest people to disappear or the language of even the smallest people to be lost."[65] He told the CPD in May 1989: "The federal structure of the State should now be filled with real political and economic content."[66] In summer 1989 the nationality situation seemed so serious that Gorbachev was forced to make a special television broadcast. He declared it his duty "to warn of the growing danger of the sharpening of relations between nationalities."[67] The theses for a special Central Committee Plenum on the nationality question, due to be held in September 1989, called for both a "strong union" and "strong republics".[68] At the same time it seemed clear that no republics would be allowed to secede.

This left open the possibility that the Kremlin might resort to military intervention to preserve the integrity of the State. Gorbachev had presided over the withdrawal from Afghanistan, and permitted Eastern Europe to go its own way, but was not willing to give up Soviet territory. These fears proved justified by the bloodbath in Baku in January 1990, when the Soviet Army massacred over a hundred Azerbaijani nationalist demonstrators. Moscow justified this action with two different explanations: it protected the Armenian population, and it prevented the seizure of power by the nationalist Popular Front of Azerbaijan. Of greater significance, however, was the effect on the Russian population. The mobilization of reservists from the RSFSR to serve in Azerbaijan led to protests and refusals to join up. For the first time, it became clear that Russians were no longer prepared to die to maintain the borders of the USSR. In turn, Moscow's failure to stamp out the conflicts in the Caucasus emboldened the leaders of nationalist movements elsewhere.[69]

Gorbachev tried to appeal to Russians by showing his sympathy with preSoviet Russian cultural traditions. In September 1986 *Pravda* quoted him as endorsing Dostoevsky's Pushkin speech. "Raisa Maksimovna and I were reading Dostoevsky. He wrote that, perhaps, the Russian heart—and I would now say that of the Soviet people—is more than anything open for brotherhood and unity." Further on he spoke of the "spirituality" of Russia.[70] In 1988, the millennium of the Russian Orthodox Church was celebrated almost as if it were a Soviet holiday. In April 1988 Gorbachev met Patriarch Pimen and assured the believers that democratization and *glasnost'* were intended to benefit them, as toilers and patriots. He promised a new law on freedom of conscience. The USSR and RSFSR Supreme Soviets each passed such a law in 1990.[71] The State made concessions to religious bodies, allowing the opening of more churches and the training of more priests. Symbolically, the Patriarchate moved from Zagorsk

back to Moscow. Gorbachev was trying to win active support for his policies from the believers, perhaps (like the *vozrozhdentsy*) seeing in them reserves of morality and energy which were lacking in the Party and State apparatuses.[72]

Calls appeared in the press for the publication of Russian religious thinkers. In 1989, two of the most influential Christian writers on Russian messianism appeared in the periodicals. *Novyi mir* published a selection of Vladimir Solovyov's writings. This included a warning about the dangers of *narodnost'* being converted into nationalism.[73] An article by Berdiaev appeared in *Voprosy filosofii* with an introduction by the contributor to *From under the Rubble,* Barabanov.[74] After 1989, the publication of formerly banned thinkers became normal and widespread.

How much support did the public give to the different nationalist tendencies, be they *gosudarstvenniki* or *vozrozhdentsy*? A Soviet opinion poll taken in Moscow in late 1988 showed that consumerist interests and desire for Westernizing reform were more widespread than the total support for both varieties of nationalism. The *gosudarstvdenniki* (a term used by the organizers of the survey) clearly had more support than those the survey described as "patriots", favouring a Russian spiritual revival.[75] In the territorial elections for the USSR CPD, Bondarev and Shafarevich failed to get in, whereas such reformers as Eltsin, Evtushenko, Korotich and Roy Medvedev were successful. The elections were not always fairly run, however, and much presumably depended on the quality of the other candidates.

The final struggle

In spring 1990 elections were to take place throughout the USSR to the republican parliaments and local Soviets. Within the RSFSR (like the USSR in 1989 but unlike the other republics, where parliaments were elected directly), voters elected a Congress of People's Deputies, which then itself elected the full-time parliament, the Supreme Soviet. As the Communist political monopoly was lifted only in March 1990, the election campaign took place on a bloc rather than a party basis, and most members of the main blocs were still members of the CPSU.

Hoping to improve on their lack of success the previous year, Russian nationalists working through the Association of Russian Artists and other bodies set up the Bloc of Public-Patriotic Groups of Russia as an electoral coalition, involving also conservative elements from the Party apparatus. The bloc campaigned for Russian sovereignty but against the dismemberment of the USSR. As in 1989, their performance was poor; none of their prominent candidates, such as Ilia Glazunov or Stanislav Kuniaev, the new chief editor of *Nash sovremennik,* were elected. Democratic reformers took control of Moscow, Leningrad and other large cities, and under the banner of Democratic Russia won over one-third of the seats in the Russian CPD.[76] Among the latter were Fr Gleb

lakunin and Viktor Aksiuchits, who after election came together and formed the Russian Christian Democratic Movement.[77]

In May 1990 Eltsin, by then the *bête noire* of the conservative nationalists, was elected Chairperson of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, despite Gorbachev's attempts to stop him. The following month democrats and conservatives in the Russian CPD joined together to vote overwhelmingly for the Declaration of State Sovereignty of the RSFSR. This declared the priority of Russian laws over those of the centre. Lithuania had declared independence in March 1990; with nearly every other Union Republic declaring sovereignty, Gorbachev seemed to have an almost impossible task in keeping the Union together. While he imposed a boycott on Lithuania, the Russian leadership under Eltsin gave support to all the pro-independence governments in the Baltic States and sought to weaken the authority of the central institutions. The growing economic crisis, with inflation rising and output falling, discredited the Soviet government and encouraged the republican elites to take more power into their own hands. Solzhenitsyn, in exile, added his voice to the anti-imperial chorus. His article "Rebuilding Russia" proposed replacing the USSR with a "Russian Union" *(Rossiiskii soiuz),* composed of the RSFSR, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan.[78] Eltsin himself emphasized his distance from Gorbachev by leaving the CPSU at its XXVIII Congress in July.

Between the summers of 1990 and 1991 the struggle intensified between conservative Communists and nationalists who wished to preserve the powers of the central authorities and roll back the process of democratization, and those who wanted to carry the process further and either weaken the centre or eliminate it altogether. The first were concentrated around the newly-formed *Soiuz* (Union) group in the USSR CPD and the CP RSFSR. They had open support from *Sovetskaia Rossiia,* the Union of Writers of the RSFSR and *Nash sovremennik,* and from a new newspaper edited by Prokhanov, *Den'* (The Day). Importantly, they had the tacit support of the leadership of the Armed Forces and the KGB. Their opponents were based around Eltsin and the RSFSR legislative and governmental structures, the Moscow and Leningrad city Soviets and the Democratic Russia movement; the Interregional Group in the USSR CPD; and among the leaders of the Baltic, Transcaucasian, Moldavian and (increasingly) Ukrainian republics. The CPSU itself was deeply split. Gorbachev was balanced unevenly between the two forces, and with support slipping away.

In the autumn of 1990, Gorbachev rejected the Shatalin Plan for radical economic reform because he feared that it would give too much power to the republics and lead to the end of the Union. This inaugurated the gloomiest period of his rule as he leaned on the conservatives for support. In October, Father Aleksandr Men, a pro-Catholic priest within the Orthodox Church with a wide following, was murdered. Nine years later his assailants had not been identified, but the Church hierarchy itself was suspected as much as the KGB. On 22 December, Patriarch Aleksii's signature turned up on a letter in *Sovetskaia Rossiia* asking Gorbachev to clamp down on separatism. The Patriarchate did

not want to lose its many churches in Ukraine. Bondarev, Prokhanov, Kuniaev and conservative military figures were, predictably, among the signatories, but the open participation of the head of the Church in a hard-line manifesto indicated the Patriarchate's difficulties in coming to terms with the changes in society. In January 1991, the Soviet security forces did indeed attempt to bring down the pro-independence governments in Lithuania and Latvia, causing deaths in Vilnius and Riga. Gorbachev claimed ignorance; he was losing control.

Seeking to re-assert his position, Gorbachev held a referendum in March 1991 to demonstrate support for the preservation of the USSR. Six of the smaller republics, however, refused to participate: Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Georgia, Armenia and Moldavia. While the nine other republics all voted overwhelmingly to keep the Union, Gorbachev's position was not in fact strengthened. Voters in the RSFSR supported Eltsin's proposal to create the post of President, while Ukraine endorsed its own Supreme Soviet's declaration of sovereignty. Gorbachev then began negotiations with the heads of the nine participating republics, including Eltsin, to rewrite the Union Treaty and transfer most powers from the centre to the republics.

In June, Eltsin was elected President of the RSFSR with a convincing 57 per cent of the vote. The runner-up, the former Soviet Prime Minister Nikolai Ryzhkov, had the support of the CP RSFSR but gained only 17 per cent. Third, with 8 per cent, was Vladimir Zhirinovsky, leader of the misnamed Liberal Democratic Party, which like Ryzhkov opposed any separation from the Soviet Union. Eltsin's advance in Russia and the progress of negotiations towards a new Union Treaty provoked consternation among conservatives. Gennady Ziuganov, the CP RSFSR ideology secretary, the writers Prokhanov, Rasputin and Bondarev and dignitaries from the power structures appealed in July through *Sovetskaia Rossiia* for the Army to take action to save the State. This appeal avoided any Marxist slogans but was cast in the patriotic language of the *gosudarstvenniki*.[79]

On 19 August, the day before the new Union Treaty was to be signed, a coup initiated by the KGB and the Armed Forces with the support of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat "temporarily" removed Gorbachev from power and scrapped the Treaty. Tanks moved into Moscow (although they stopped at red lights). The Patriarch asked that violence be avoided. Gorbachev refused to capitulate; Eltsin travelled to the Russian parliament and led the resistance from there. Big demonstrations against the coup took place in Leningrad and Moscow. Russian society had changed too much to return to the days before Gorbachev, and the coup leaders were unwilling to risk the use of violence on a mass scale. The coup collapsed in less than three days.[80]

Gorbachev returned to office as Soviet President, but it was now Eltsin who was effectively in charge. All the republics declared their independence. The CPSU Central Committee was dissolved by Gorbachev, its own General Secretary, the Party was banned in Russia and the leaders of the coup were arrested. Whereas Gorbachev had been elected USSR President only by

members of the CPD, Eltsin had the mandate of the people of Russia. Gorbachev now lacked any mass base of support. When in December 1991 the Ukrainian electorate in a referendum opted for independence with 90 per cent support, Eltsin and his advisers decided to end the USSR. The Russian President and the leaders of the two other Slav republics, Ukraine and Belarus, met at Belavezhskaia pushcha near Minsk and announced that the USSR was no more. In its place would be a Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Symbolizing their desire for support from the West, they informed US President George Bush before telling Gorbachev. After meeting successively Gorbachev and Eltsin, the leadership of the Soviet Armed Forces announced their support for the CIS. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet also approved the establishment of the CIS, and renamed the RSFSR the Russian Federation. By the end of the month all the Soviet republics except the Baltic States and Georgia had joined the CIS, and Eltsin as President of the Russian Federation had occupied Gorbachev's office in the Kremlin.[81]

The coup had been intended to save the USSR. Instead it accelerated its demise. Before then, not only had many of the non-Russian republics shown their desire for independence, but most of the Russians themselves had lost the desire to maintain the old Communist structures, or the will to maintain the Union itself. The Communist Party had created the Soviet Union; with the Party banned, democratization and political pluralism meant that the country could no longer be held together by force. Although Gorbachev had failed in his original aim of reforming and strengthening the Union, he achieved a later aim of ending the totalitarian system. The age of empire was over. In Ilya Prizel's words, "it was the Russians in fact who brought about the demise of the Soviet Union and its messianic idea."[82] The coalition of Communism and Russian Orthodox messianism could no longer command support in Russia, as the majority of the population opted for the uncertainties of freedom.

10
Post-Soviet Russia
The victories and defeat of Gennady Ziuganov

This chapter will investigate how, after the demise of the Soviet Union, Russian messianism rose again to become a major force from within the opposition Communist Party.

The failure of the reformers

The USSR ceased to exist on 31 December 1991; on 2 January 1992 the Russian government began to implement a programme of economic shock therapy, worked out by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the Deputy Prime Minister Egor Gaidar. These economic reforms sharply accelerated both the decline in output and the rate of inflation, which rose to 2,000 per cent over the year 1992. Living standards fell and poverty increased. Over the next few years many Russians found that their wages and pensions were paid late or not at all. The process of privatization benefited former political and economic elites and a small number of "oligarchs", whose conspicuous lifestyle far outshone that of the old Communist bosses. Corruption and crime prospered, with perhaps billions of dollars of IMF loans disappearing and people at the very top of the State coming under suspicion. Meanwhile life expectancy fell and with it the size of the population.

Arguably, the destruction of the Soviet Union was a precondition for radical reform in Russia. Elites in most of the other republics had not before then been persuaded of the need for reform, whereas in Russia the continuing mass popularity of Eltsin, at least in the early years, safeguarded the reform process and promoted acceptance of the new political arrangements. Nevertheless, the events of December 1991 thrust Russia into an identity crisis from which it is yet to emerge. Moscow lost one-quarter of the territory and nearly one-half of the population of the Soviet Union; the Russian Federation still had the largest territory in the world, but it was no longer a superpower. But was the Russian Federation really Russia, and what did it mean to be Russian?[1]

The RSFSR had never been conceived in ethnic terms; it was, rather, a residue —the USSR minus the Union Republic territories, which were designed as homelands for the major Soviet nationalities. Russians had been successfully

brought up to think of their homeland as the whole USSR rather than the RSFSR, whereas other nationalities living in their own Union Republics identified much more readily with their republics. Suddenly 25 million ethnic Russians, outside the Russian Federation, found to their bewilderment that they were no longer citizens of the USSR but ethnic minorities in independent states. As these new states began the task of nation-building, usually promoting their local languages and nearly always seeking to promote local cadres to influential positions, the Russians living there often felt discriminated against. It became clear over time that Moscow was unable or unwilling to provide assistance to its Russian compatriots. This was a humiliating position for Russians, inside and outside the Russian Federation.[2] Still harder to accept was the loss of Ukraine, since Russians saw Kiev as the cradle of Russian civilization.

Who were the Russian people? According to the 1989 census, 81.5 per cent of the RSFSR population were ethnic Russians, with traditionally Muslim nationalities forming about one-half of the remainder. In November 1991 nationalists took power in Chechnia in the North Caucasus and declared independence. The Russian Supreme Soviet vetoed Eltsin's proposals to crush the rebellion forcibly. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, there was a fear that other Autonomous Republics might follow Chechnia, and the Russian Federation itself might suffer the fate of the USSR. Part of the Eltsin leadership's strategy to win the support of the ethnic minorities was to create a civic Russian *(rossiiskaia)* identity and to refer to the citizens of the new state as *rossiiane* (inhabitants of Russia) rather than *russkie* (ethnic Russians).[3] The 1993 Russian Constitution referred to the "multinational people *[mnogonatsional'nyi narod]* of the Russian Federation", thereby expressing continuity with Soviet rhetoric, and the hierarchy of ethnicized territories (republic, autonomous *oblast'* and autonomous district) established by Leninist nationality policy was preserved.[4]

As well as following a Western prescription for the transition to a market economy, the Eltsin leadership also adopted a broadly pro-Western foreign policy. Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev wanted Russia to become a full member of the "civilized world", and the government hoped for Western help to consolidate its reforms. Just as Gorbachev had supported the West's military campaign against Iraq in 1991, Kozyrev continued to support Western initiatives through the United Nations, including sanctions against Iraq and later Yugoslavia. However much the regime looked towards Europe and America, it nevertheless could not escape the consequences of conflict within the former Soviet Union (FSU). In South Ossetia, Abkhazia, Moldavia and Nagorny Karabakh ethnic and political conflict had emerged in the final years of the USSR; in Tajikistan a civil war broke out in 1992. The Russian leadership feared not so much that conflict might extend into Russia as that the breakdown of order in Russia's new neighbours might lead to crime, arms, illegal drugs or refugees flowing across Russia's porous borders. Some saw political Islam as a special threat. Instability in Transcaucasia or the emergence of hostile

governments there would make it harder for Russia to retain control over the Northern Caucasus.

From the early days, it became clear that the CIS was not living up to Russian expectations as a forum for co-operation with the former Soviet republics. The Ukrainian leaders saw the CIS as a means to attaining independence, dissolving ties with Russia and joining the West. As a result, while CIS summits produced many fine proposals for co-operation, the great majority were not implemented. Before the end of 1992 the Russian Ministry of Defence had concluded that it would have to be directly involved in conflict resolution on post-Soviet territory. Thus in February 1993 Eltsin proposed that the United Nations or the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe should grant Russia a "security mandate" to preserve order throughout the FSU.[5] Critics in the Supreme Soviet and the nationalist and Communist opposition attacked the government for neglecting Russian minorities, and Russian interests in general, in the FSU. They accused Kozyrev of abandoning former Soviet allies in the Middle East and Yugoslavia in his desire to gain Western approval and IMF credits. In 1992 the Supreme Soviet challenged the validity of the transfer, back in 1954, of the Crimea from the RSFSR to Ukraine, and in 1993 it declared Sevastopol, the Crimean naval base, a Russian city. These moves embarrassed the Russian government and complicated relations with Ukraine. Both government and opposition were finding it hard to accept the end of the Union.

Indeed, since 1992, the Russian nationalist and Communist opposition has sought to exploit nostalgia for the Soviet past, when everyone had a job and was paid on time and the country was a superpower. While the Communist Party was banned, conservative Communists such as Gennady Ziuganov and Richard Kosolapov joined with former members of the USSR Supreme Soviet and Russian nationalist politicians in establishing a "National Salvation Front". Branded by the government a "Red-Brown alliance", this body also included the established Soviet writers Prokhanov, Rasputin and Belov, and the former dissidents Shafarevich and Osipov on its organizing committee. At first calling for the "national revival of Russia",[6] they moved to demanding the restoration of the USSR.[7] When the Communist Party of the Russian Federation (CPRF) was allowed to form, it was Ziuganov who was chosen as leader, with backing from Prokhanov's *Den*'.

The principal opposition to Eltsin and his government in 1992–3 came not from the Communists, however, but from the Supreme Soviet headed by Ruslan Khasbuiatov and the Vice-President Aleksandr Rutskoi. The power struggle between President and parliament culminated in Eltsin's decision to dissolve the parliament. When the Supreme Soviet refused to go, Eltsin laid siege to it. These two weeks in September–October 1993 represented the most tense period since August 1991. Within the parliament building were some paramilitary forces of Russian National Unity (RNE), which had replaced *Pamiat*' as the main voice of the extreme Right. Led by Aleksandr Barkashov, its symbol was a slightly modified swastika. Rutskoi, having been declared President by the parliament,

attempted to seize power in Moscow and almost captured the Ostankino television station. In response Eltsin sent in tanks to destroy the parliamentary resistance. Hundreds of people were killed. Much of the intelligentsia who had been supportive of Eltsin's reforms were horrified at the carnage and blamed the President as well as Rutskoi and Khasbulatov for failing to avoid it.[8]

The Eltsin leadership was in serious trouble. It had failed to persuade Russians that it was worth suffering now during the transition to a market economy because of the wealth they would gain in the future. The Communists had made similar promises for seventy years. Now Eltsin had violated the symbol of resistance to the August coup, the Russian parliament. Yet worse was to come: in December 1994 Eltsin sent tanks and planes in a futile attempt to crush Chechnia, killing tens of thousands of ethnic Russians and Chechens in the process.[9]

The Russian idea and the opposition

It is not surprising that many people sought alternatives to Westernizers and Communists in the "Russian idea" *(russkaia ideia)*. As Tim McDaniel has pointed out, the "Russian idea" as it was understood in the 1990s was rather wider than Berdiaev's concept of Russian messianism. McDaniel defines it as "the conviction that Russia has its own independent, self-sufficient and eminently worthy cultural and historical tradition that both sets it apart from the West and guarantees its future flourishing".[10] Hence there was growing interest in studies of Muscovite Russia and the Third Rome.[11] A number of anthologies and analyses dealt with the Russian idea, focusing mainly on the thinkers considered in this book.[12] Evgeny Troitsky's "Rebirth of the Russian Idea", completed in late 1991, includes a wide range of aspirations in the Russian idea: spiritual, *"sobornost* and holiness, love, sacrifice, bravery"; political, "a single indivisible Russia, true national statehood"; and economic, to end the injustice of Russia's exploitation by the other Soviet republics. Troitskii makes a messianic claim: "The rebirth of the Russian idea, as of Russia itself, corresponds to the interests of all humanity and makes possible the preservation of world civilization from death."[13]

Before turning to the position of the Communist Party, I shall discuss the position of some important figures for whom Orthodoxy occupied a central position. Viktor Aksiuchits called for the "spiritual rebirth of the individual and the nation".[14] He had split with his fellow Christian Democrat, Fr Gleb lakunin, and broken with Democratic Russia in late 1991 because he favoured the maintenance of the Union, as a Russian-dominated State, and cited the March 1991 referendum in his support. When Eltsin dissolved the Russian parliament, Aksiuchits found himself with "Communist and anti-Communist patriots", opposing a government which was "in alliance with the Western financial and political oligarchy".[15] In contrast, lakunin remained with the radical reformers and used his position in the Supreme Soviet to investigate KGB penetration into the Orthodox Church. This led to a court action from the Ministry of Security

(the KGB's successor) and then in November 1993 to his defrocking by the Holy Synod.[16] Not even in the Communist period had the Moscow Patriarchate gone to such lengths to silence him.

Solzhenitsyn, like Aksiuchits, was another anti-Communist who rejected the Eltsin regime, though he did agree to return to live in Russia. Gaidar's reforms, he wrote, were "a plan based not on the 'preservation of the people' but rather a cruel 'shock' administered to it".[17] The corrupt government was selling off Russian resources cheaply to the West, and ignoring ill-treatment of Russians in the former Soviet republics. Meanwhile, the Russian people were dying out, and the "Russian Question" was now "Shall our people *be* or *not be*?"[18] In 1996, following Eltsin's re-election, Solzhenitsyn declared: "Nothing resembling democracy currently exists in Russia." Instead an oligarchy of ex-Communists and nouveaux riches ruled.[19]

Nationalist positions, linked with Orthodoxy, were adopted by the 1996 Presidential contenders Vladimir Zhirinovsky and Aleksandr Lebed. Zhirinovsky maintained a tight hold over his party; it was officially known as the Liberal-Democratic Party of Russia—Party of Zhirinovsky. He proclaimed the need to restore the Russian State to the Soviet borders, but abolishing the republics which had existed in Soviet times. At other times he spoke of bringing back Finland into Russia, and, in his "Last Thrust to the South", of Russia pacifying the Middle East and reaching the Indian Ocean. This was a task of global significance since it would save the planet from a third world war. Zhirinovsky had nothing to offer the minorities, referring to the *russkaia* (rather than *rossiiskaia*) nation and army, and complaining about the behaviour in Russia of people from the Caucasus (whom he called "cockroaches").[20]

As Robert Service has suggested, his views are eclectic. "He blends Russian chauvinism, Marxism-Leninism, Eurasianism, European fascism, individualism, Slavophilism, multiculturalism and the contemporary consumerism."[21] Zhirinovsky is sometimes referred to as an ultra-nationalist, and his concern for Russia's geopolitical role puts him in the camp of nationalist messianism. He reached the peak of his popularity in the December 1993 elections for the State Duma, held under Eltsin's new Constitution two months after the dispersal of the Supreme Soviet. His party came top in the section of the chamber elected on the basis of party lists, with 22.9 per cent of the vote.[22] This success reflected not only his tactic of promising all things to all persons, his hard stance against crime and his interesting television manner, but also his ability to capitalize on the mood of Russian national humiliation.

General Aleksandr Lebed came to Russian public attention when he was Commander of the Russian 14th Army in Moldova in 1992. Moldovan forces had attacked the separatist enclave of Transdniestria, an unrecognized statelet established by pro-Soviet diehards, supposedly to defend the interests of the Russian and Ukrainian majority living there. Lebed used the 14th Army to drive away the Moldovan forces, earning the gratitude of the local Slav population and hero status in Russia. In 1995 he joined the Congress of Russian Communities

(KRO), a small Russian nationalist body which concerned itself with the fate of ethnic Russian minorities and also promoted the unity of Russians, Ukrainians and Belorussians.[23] The KRO failed to cross the 5 per cent threshold to enter the State Duma in the December 1995 elections on the party lists, but Lebed himself stood against Eltsin for President in June 1996 and came third with 14.5 per cent of the vote.[24] Recruited by Eltsin to be National Security Advisor and Secretary of the Security Council, Lebed negotiated the Khasaviurt Accords ending the state of war between Chechnia and Russia and giving the Chechens de facto independence. This reflected Lebed's ethnic Russian nationalism: he rejected the desire of Zhirinovsky to restore the Russian Empire, and of the Communists to restore the USSR, and he had no desire to retain non-Russians inside the Russian Federation against their will, but he wished to defend ethnic Russians.[25] It was typical of Eltsin that he should sack Lebed after his peace-making success.

While the CPRF, emerging from the ban, came only third in the 1993 elections with 12.4 per cent of the party list vote,[26] it gradually built up support in subsequent years under Ziuganov's leadership. It had by far the largest number of members of any party in Russia. Gennady Andreevich Ziuganov, born in 1944 in a village in Oryol *oblast*', spent most of his life in Komsomol and Party work. He served in the Central Committee apparatus from 1983 until he was made ideology secretary and politburo member of the CP RSFSR at its foundation in June 1990.[27] Ziuganov developed a fusion of Marxism-Leninism, Stalinism, Russian imperialism and Russian nationalism which venerated Orthodox Christianity. "The Orthodox Church, by tradition, occupies a special place in the history of Russia. More than once, our statehood has been reborn thanks to its support."[28]

Ziuganov, by then Chairperson of the Central Committee of the CPRF, laid out his views in his book "Russia and the Contemporary World" in mid-1995.[29] The publisher was the "Spiritual Heritage" movement, headed by Aleksei Podberezkin, then Ziuganov's close advisor. Podberezkin is a non-Communist nationalist who after December 1995 joined the Communist faction in the State Duma, but who also wrote the political programme of "Our Home is Russia", the government party headed by Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin.[30]

It is not the nineteenth-century Russian revolutionary intelligentsia that Ziuganov takes as his inspiration, but their conservative opponents: Leontev and Danilevsky, and the latter's theory of "cultural-historical types". Their view of Russia, or Slavdom, as an Orthodox civilization opposed to that of the West is central to Ziuganov's thought. For his concept of the Russian idea he cites Vladimir Solovyov, Berdiaev and Bulgakov, among others; on the biological genesis of the Russians he looks to Lev Gumilyov, who after his appearance in *Veche* in the 1970s was published in books for a mass Soviet audience from 1989.[31] Ziuganov seeks to combine his Danilevskian views with a concept of "Eurasia" taken from the Eurasianist Russian *émigrés* of the 1920s and from Gumilyov. He approves Gumilyov's call for a Eurasian nationalism, embracing

all the peoples of the Soviet Union, Orthodox and Islamic; he mourns the decline of what he calls the "imperial Eurasian consciousness".[32]

The basis of Russian statehood, for Ziuganov, was the Russian idea, encompassing "great-power attitudes *[derzhavnost'], narodnost',* spirituality and patriotism". He emphasized his commitment to the *gosudarstvennik* tradition. "Russia has long since seen itself as the keeper of the great-power and imperial legacy." Ziuganov saw this both in the thesis of "Moscow, the Third Rome" and in Uvarov's triad.[33] It is hardly necessary to say that Ziuganov's position here was the very opposite of Lenin's. The October Revolution, according to Ziuganov, was accepted by the majority of the people, in spite of the lack of the preconditions of socialism, since the Bolsheviks prevented the disintegration of Russia as a nation and a state. The socialist model had, however, after the death of Stalin, begun to lose its way, aping Western consumerism.[34]

It was the Russian idea which made capitalism unacceptable. Ziuganov saw Russia as "a special world, a whole 'social cosmos', with its own specific historical, geopolitical, ideological, national and economic features, in which the general laws of social development are refracted in a special way. The present Russian Federation is still not the whole of Russia but a stump with bloody torn-off limbs… Capitalism does not go organically into the flesh and blood, the daily life, customs and psychology of our society."[35]

Ziuganov spoke of enemies of Russia trying to destroy it: Eltsin's regime, America, and "the cosmopolitan elite of international capital… The West is interested in the weakening, the dismemberment and if possible the enslavement of Russia". International capital is forced to accept the existence of independent Russia; but today Russia is "the main obstacle on the road to the creation of a 'new world order"'.[36] Ziuganov accused the proponents of the "new world order" (a phrase initiated by President Bush after the collapse of European Communism) of messianism:

> It is a universal messianic, eschatological religious project, on a scale of planning and preparation far exceeding the forms of planetary Utopias known in history, be they the Roman imperialism of the times of Tiberius and Diocletian, the Caliphate of the Abbasids, the Protestant-fundamentalist movement in Europe or the Trotskyist daydreams of World Revolution.[37]

Undoubtedly, the decision of NATO to take into membership former Warsaw Pact countries, bringing the Atlantic alliance up to the Russian frontier in Kaliningrad *oblast',* gave credence to Ziuganov's claims among the Russian audience.

Is it legitimate to place Ziuganov's own ideas in the category of Russian messianism? In 1995 "Spiritual Heritage" published a book entitled *The Contemporary Russian Idea and the State,* listing Ziuganov as chief editor and

Podberezkin as chief author. The work sought to develop a "Russian idea" capable of regenerating the nation:

> In the distant past, the pivot [of the Russian idea] was the messianic idea—to be the chief, if not the only, bearer of true Christian values, and after the fall of Byzantium, also of Orthodox statehood: "two Romes have been, the third Rome is Moscow, and the fourth will not be" …The Russian idea concentrated on the historic mission, chosen by God, of the Russian people, and it was seen as "suffering for others".

In the Soviet period the Russian people had been prevented from expressing their individuality as a people. Now, the essence of the Russian idea was "the preservation and revival of the nation, also including its parts 'abroad', and real help to all nations and nationalities living in Russia for their self-determination in the unified multinational state".[38]

In his introduction to the volume, Ziuganov wrote: "Russia is the bearer of an ancient spiritual tradition, the fundamental values of which are *sobornost'* (collectivism), *derzhavnost*' (state self-sufficiency) and the striving to incarnate the highest 'heavenly' ideals of justice and brotherhood in reality on Earth."[39] Ziuganov can be placed within the canon of Russian messianism, although taking more from the "Third Rome" imperial and the Slavophil wings rather than from Lenin's internationalist revolution.

Ziuganov's ideas were not always adopted in full by the CPRF. More traditional Marxist-Leninist views were also present there.[40] Nevertheless references to *sobornost*', *derzhavnost*' and spirituality made it into the 1995 party programme, along with the sentence "In its essence the 'Russian idea' is a deeply socialist idea."[41] This combination of Orthodoxy and Communism goes some way towards the urgings of Mikhail Antonov and Gennady Shimanov in the samizdat of the 1970s.

Just before the December 1995 elections to the State Duma, Ziuganov produced a book entitled I *Believe in Russia*.[42] This title evoked Tiutchev's lines and the views of Dostoevsky's character Shatov. The book included a CPRF election appeal, entitled "For our Soviet Motherland!" This announced that a revived Russia would "turn to the governments and peoples of the illegally dismembered Soviet Union with a call for the voluntary re-creation of a unified Union state".[43]

In the elections, the CPRF won easily. On the party list vote it came first with 22.3 per cent, followed by 11.2 per cent for Zhirinovsky's party and 10.1 per cent for Our Home is Russia. Since it also won nearly a quarter of the single-member constituencies, it finished with one-third of the seats overall. With its allies, it almost held a majority.[44] Ziuganov himself was well in the lead in the opinion polls for the presidential elections, while Eltsin's support was in single figures.

If one victory for Ziuganov was in the State Duma, the other was his success in influencing the symbols and even the policies of the Eltsin regime.[45] The latter saw its vulnerability to the growing title of nostalgia for the Soviet era which Ziuganov was tapping into. Eltsin depended for his support on the continuation of reform, but could undercut Ziuganov's support by seeking to identify with some of the successes of the Soviet period. The Poklonnaia gora memorial complex in Moscow, planned since Brezhnev's time to commemorate the Soviet dead in the Second World War, was finally completed in 1995, just in time for the fiftieth anniversary of the victory. On the anniversary, Prime Minister Chernomyrdin paid tribute to Stalin's wartime role, although Eltsin did not go this far. Nevertheless the President stood on a partly-covered Lenin Mausoleum while veterans marched past carrying hammer-and-sickle flags.[46]

Turning to policy issues, Eltsin made clear his opposition to NATO enlargement—a stance supported by virtually the whole political spectrum in Russia. Eltsin could not reunify the Soviet Union, but he could attempt to promote integration within the CIS. In September 1995 he issued a presidential decree to this effect.[47] In January 1996, following the Duma election, he appointed Evgeny Primakov as Foreign Minister. Primakov took a less pro-Western line than Kozyrev and urged integration within the CIS, receiving consistent support from the Communists. In March 1996 the Communists got the State Duma to pass a resolution renouncing the Belavezhskaia pushcha treaty which had established the CIS. This had no legal force and Eltsin ridiculed it; but it alarmed the leaders of the CIS states, who rallied to support Eltsin. The latter strengthened his position by signing an agreement to create a "Community of Sovereign Republics" *(SSR)* with Aleksandr Lukashenko, the dictatorial President of Belarus. Eltsin could claim that while the Communists were making meaningless declarations, he was rebuilding the ties with the former Soviet republics.

On 8 June 1996 Ziuganov addressed the Congress of People's Patriotic Forces, the electoral alliance headed by the CPRF. He had some justification to say that Eltsin was promising to carry out much of the Communist election platform. Integration among the former Soviet republics was strengthening, and the Red Banner of Victory had regained official status.[48] The reality was that without using his rival's messianic rhetoric, Eltsin had borrowed some of Ziuganov's best clothes. In the first round of the election on 16 June, Eltsin with 35.3 per cent was narrowly ahead of Ziuganov with 32.0 per cent. Lebed was third with 14.5 per cent, followed by the liberal Grigory Iavlinsky with 7.3 per cent and Zhirinovsky with 5.7 per cent. On the second round on 3 July, Eltsin gained 53.8 per cent against Ziuganov's 40.3 per cent: 40 million votes against 30 million.[49]

Why did Ziuganov lose? Undoubtedly Lebed's support for Eltsin helped the President. The media were heavily biased in Eltsin's favour and the oligarchs pumped money into his campaign. Eltsin had taken over some of Ziuganov's policies, but he also emphasized the Communist record, the Gulag, repression

and other negative features of the Communist era. Given that the Constitution gave most power to the President and little to the State Duma, Russians might be willing to cast a protest vote in the parliamentary elections but then vote against the Communists in the Presidential elections where it really mattered. The majority of voters, especially the younger generation, did not want to lose the freedom that they had gained. This was not just political and religious freedom, but freedom to enjoy Western culture and goods, to travel and to engage in business. They had had enough of messianic ideologies, Communist or nationalist, and voted for Eltsin as the lesser evil.

Ironically, having been re-elected, Eltsin himself decided that Russia needed a new ideology, and gave his aides a year to discover it.[50] Needless to say, three years later they were no nearer to finding it. Apart from the fact that the Russian Federation is constitutionally supposed to be secular and free of a ruling idea, it seems inconceivable that a society as ideologically divided as Russia could find a set of ideas that did not exclude at least one major section.

The Russian Orthodox Church was keen to promote its claims as the traditional religion. In alliance with nationalists within the Ministry of Defence, the Patriarchate has been trying to build a network of chaplains within the armed forces. Most political forces sought support from the church. Metropolitan Ioann of St Petersburg and Ladoga peddled the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" myth in the early 1990s and presented a religious column in the Communist *Sovetskaia Rossiia*.[51] Nevertheless, neither the regime nor the Communist opposition wished to alienate the Muslim nationalities by giving a monopoly to Orthodoxy. The Moscow Patriarchate was concerned at the successful proselytizing of Western-based Protestant groups, Jehovah's Witnesses and other sects. It also has a long-standing fear of Roman Catholic penetration, enhanced by the eastward orientation of the Polish Pope, John Paul II. The State Duma, under Communist inspiration, agreed to meet the Patriarchate's concerns in the 1997 Law on Freedom of Conscience. This gave privileges to four "traditional religions"—Orthodoxy, Islam, Buddhism and Judaism, but made it easier for local authorities to ban the activities of "foreign" religions. Despite Western pressure on Eltsin to veto the bill, which in some ways marked a return to the state control over religion of the Soviet era, he finally signed it into law.[52] Within the Church followers of loann continued after his death to advocate support for the Communists.[53]

Orthodoxy also played a role in the debates in Russia over relations with Serbia. Following Danilevsky and Dostoevsky, Ziuganov's Communists consistently advocated support for the Serbs in the conflicts in former Yugoslavia, on the basis of pan-Orthodox and pan-Slav solidarity. The Russian government, however, took a pragmatic approach, seeking to mediate between the West and the Belgrade regime of Slobodan Miloševi and thereby rebuild its influence in world diplomacy. During the 1999 Kosovo war, public opinion in Russia, except in the Muslim republics, was strongly pro-Serb, but there was little support for the call of Zhirinovsky and some Communists for Russian

soldiers to be sent to help the Serbs against NATO. Nevertheless, anti-Western feeling was stronger in Russia during the Kosovo war than at any time since the Cold War. NATO had attacked a sovereign Slav state, without a direct mandate from the United Nations. Might it not also attack Russia in the future, if Russia was unprepared? Solzhenitsyn accused NATO of following the law of the jungle.[54] But the pragmatists in Russia remained in charge. Chernomyrdin with Finnish help mediated a settlement between NATO and Yugoslavia, and the Russian Army moved swiftly to take part in the international peace-keeping force, K-FOR.

In the late 1990s, the most significant politician outside the Eltsin regime to play with Russian nationalism was the ambitious and powerful Mayor of Moscow, lury Luzhkov. A CPSU member from 1968 to 1991, as Mayor from 1992 he devoted considerable resources to the rebuilding of the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour. Playing on popular resentment against traders and "mafia" from the "South", he periodically had people from the Caucasus thrown out of Moscow. In international affairs he distinguished himself by his claim that Sevastopol was a Russian city.[55] With his worker's cloth cap covering his bald head and his influence over the Moscow banking system he offered a serious challenge to the unpopular Eltsin "family".

The 1990s showed that there remained a significant constituency in Russia that was susceptible to Communist and nationalist ideas. Ziuganov's programme found resonance. As Anatol Lieven has pointed out, however, there was no occasion when Russians could be said to have been mobilized on an ethnic basis, as, for example, the Serbs in Croatia and Bosnia or the various nationalities of the Caucasus (except perhaps briefly in Transdniestria in 1992).[56] Many Russians were demoralized and apathetic, especially the older generations, while the younger generation sought directly to improve their private material situation. After Ziuganov's election defeat in 1996, the CPRF ceased to appear to be a possible alternative government, although it could still be a haven for protest voters in parliamentary elections.

Conclusion

I have tried to show that Russian messianism, the concept of the Russians as the chosen people, has persisted as a trend of thought in one form or another since the sixteenth century, with roots going back much earlier. It has usually been linked with Russian Orthodoxy. It has by no means always been a dominant trend, but has emerged and re-emerged periodically throughout Russian history, up to the 1990s. The ideas have been transmitted from one generation to the next in a number of ways: through the Russian Orthodox Church and the Old Believers, through literature, through revolutionary organizations and in its Marxist variant through the propaganda apparatus of the Communist Party. I have shown how wide the range is of ideas and moods which can be labelled Russian messianism. Some writers fit in more easily than others; some slip into or out of the boundaries, and it is no easier to define Russian messianism than to define the Russian people. There is no "Party of Russian Messianists", and many to whom the label has been applied would reject it.

The concept of a "chosen people" penetrated into Christian thought from Judaism. It emerged in a number of Christian countries in the West. In northwest Europe it first took the form of radical millenarian movements. From the seventeenth century it accompanied the revolutions in England, the USA and France, as politicians and ideologists sought to spread the good news to other lands. In Russia, however, messianism has recurred repeatedly in intellectual thought and, it appears, in the popular consciousness as well. Berdiaev was right to highlight this tendency, although he exaggerated it, since there were other, non-messianic trends in intellectual and political thought. While the concept of the chosen people was not as central to Russian consciousness as it was to Judaism, for some Russian thinkers it became the main feature of their philosophy.

As with Jewish and Polish messianism, it was at crisis points that Russian messianism sometimes came to the fore: the formation of the Russian State around Muscovy and the struggle against the Tatar yoke; the period of the crisis of serfdom, threatened by pressure from the serfs and (more questionably) from tendencies favouring capitalist development, a crisis which was accompanied by the appearance of Slavophilism; the period of the crisis of the autocracy, from

the 1870s to 1917, and the early revolutionary years, which were accompanied by the development of *narodnichestvo* and of a Russian form of Marxism which was heavily influenced by the narodniks; Stalinism, with the messianic slogan "Socialism in one country", in reaction to the capitalist encirclement of Russia, and the messianism of the Great Patriotic War; in the Brezhnev period, when Russia seemed to some to be threatened not only by the possibility of thermonuclear war destroying all humanity, but specifically by biological degeneration, drunkenness, falling life expectancy, corruption, the rise of non-Russian nationalism and the possibility of war with China; and during and after the final collapse of the Soviet Union, a period of mass poverty, unprecedented corruption and Russian national humiliation.

In Russia, two trends of messianist thought may be identified, one emphasizing the State and the other emphasizing the people. In the sixteenth century, the theory of "Moscow, the Third Rome", as developed in the Orthodox Church, centred on the person of the Tsar and the Muscovite State. The popular folklore of "Holy Rus'" put the emphasis on the land and the people. In the hands of Prince Kurbsky, the Old Believers and later opponents of the Tsar, it was a subversive instrument, when accompanied by allegations that the occupant of the Muscovite or Petersburg throne had betrayed Russian traditions. The nationalist view of messianism as rule over others was linked with the State and chauvinism; the universalist view of messianism as service was linked with the Russian people and the land.

The concepts of the "Third Rome" and of "Holy Russia" were not entirely mutually exclusive; both emanated from Orthodoxy, and on occasion the notion of "Holy Rus'" was used by supporters of the autocracy, especially in the last decades before 1917. The term "Slavophil" has been applied to opponents of the policy of the Petersburg autocracy, and to supporters of it. The early Moscow Slavophils supported the principle of autocracy but believed that the tsars were betraying the principle, particularly since the reign of Peter the Great. They emphasized Russia's uniqueness and hoped she would avoid the capitalist path of development followed by the West. Some saw Russia as having the role of saving Europe, through her Orthodoxy and the *obshchina*. The Slavophils were influenced by, but different from, the ideologists of "official *narodnost*'" who backed the Petersburg regime and rejected messianism. While the Slavophil Konstantin Aksakov saw the State as an "evil", his brother Ivan came for a time to see the Russian State as a possible instrument of Russian messianism. Narodnik messianism was nearly always opposed to the Russian State, except for a brief period following October 1917 when the Left SRs thought that the New World was dawning; on the other hand, Bolshevik and Stalinist messianism supported the State from October 1917. Under Brezhnev, two major tendencies of Russian messianism and Russian nationalism could be identified. On one side, the *gpsudarstvenniki* favoured a strong Russian State, and saw this State as the main reason for the existence of the Russian people. On the other side, the *uozrozhdentsy* saw the policies of the Soviet State and, by implication at least,

the Marxist ideology as responsible for the demoralization of the Russian people. They favoured the cultural and moral revival of the Russian people, explicitly or implicitly linked with Russian Orthodoxy. Both these tendencies had some access to official media but also used samizdat.

Ianov's view that Russian nationalism inevitably leads to a convergence with the State is not borne out by the development of nineteenth-century Slavophilism. When, after the revolutions of 1848, Nicholas I inaugurated a cultural and political clampdown, the "official nationalist" Pogodin joined the Slavophils in opposing the Tsar's policy. It was when the State began to reform, in the early years of Alexander II, that Slavophils such as Samarin and Koshelyov became involved in the State structure, by participating in drawing up the plans for the emancipation of the serfs. When Slavophilism developed into pan-Slavism, it was still regarded by the State as subversive. Even when Ivan Aksakov came out in favour of the State and against the nihilists, the authorities still suspected him and periodically censored his journals. The other branches from the Slavophil tree were even less acceptable to the regime. Vladimir Solovyov's pro-Catholic universalist messianism could be tolerated neither by the Church nor by the State, and Fyodorov's project for world unity under Russian leadership could be published only after his death. Among the narodniks, Mikhailovsky hoped that the autocracy would be a barrier to capitalist development, but he can hardly be considered a supporter of the regime. Most narodniks were revolutionaries. The policy of Russification and anti-Semitic pogroms, followed under the last two tsars, had little in common with Slavophil ideology.

From 1917, Russian patriotism seems to have been used more successfully by the Bolsheviks than by their opponents. While Lenin would not have liked to be called a messianist, Russian messianism effectively entered the service of the Communist Party, especially after the proclamation of "Socialism in one country". The rehabilitation of the Russian past in the 1930s and the relaxation of relations with the Orthodox Church during the war meant that Orthodoxy could be mobilized in support of the regime. Moscow was again the Third Rome, as far as the Church was concerned. De-Stalinization led to the loosening of the controls that had been placed on the expression of Russian nationalist ideas. Together with the decline in faith in official Marxism-Leninism, the political situation favoured the resurgence of official and dissident Russian nationalism which appeared in the Brezhnev era.

The division between what Russian nationalist literature could and what could not be officially published under Brezhnev did not correspond to the division between the nationalism which focused on the Russian State and that which focused on the Russian people. In official publications, the *gosudarstvnniki* attacked the moralism of the officially published *derevenshchiki,* while *gosudarstvenniki* and supporters of human rights collaborated on the samizdat journal *Veche*. It is tempting to draw parallels between the *gosudarstvenniki* and *vozrozhdentsy* in the 1970s–1980s, and the "official nationalists" and the Slavophils under Nicholas I. The methods of Peter I seem to be generally

admired by the *gosudarstvnniki,* as they were by the official nationalists, but rejected by the *vozrozhdentsy,* as they were by the Slavophils. In their attitude to more recent phenomena, writers under communism sometimes needed to be more circumspect. *Vozrozhdentsy* who were published officially normally had to declare their support of the October Revolution (although this changed under Gorbachev), whereas those in samizdat were under no such obligation; *gosudarstuenniki* both in the official media and in samizdat declared their loyalty to Leninism. Most *vozrozhdentsy* were doubtful about the means of collectivization of agriculture, and probably also of the end.

Not all nationalists fitted into *the gosudarstvmnik/vozrozhdents* dichotomy. Just as Pogodin represented the nationalist wing of official *narodnost'* (as opposed to the dynastic wing of Bulgarin and Grech), so Glazunov and Soloukhin with their emphasis on religious motifs, together with their political proximity to the regime (at least under Brezhnev), fell between the two categories. Nevertheless, the differences between the two wings should not be underestimated. In Russian history, as Herzen and Miliukov said, there was a gulf between the State and the people. The Russian historian Vasily O.Kliuchevsky put it very well when he wrote before the revolution on Russia's political development: "The state swelled up; the people grew lean".[1] This was still truer of the expansion of the State under Stalin, at the expense of the Russian people. The socialist dissident Pyotr Abovin-Egides aptly summed up the *gosudarstvmnik* view in the phrase "not Russia for the people, but the people for Russia".[2] He then linked this with the "Third Rome" imperial idea.[3] Solzhenitsyn in *From under the Rubble* showed his rejection of the *gosudarstvmnik* ideology. Kheifets portrayed the *gosudarstvenniki* as considering the Russian people to be fools who are easily manipulated, like figures on a chessboard, by evil foreigners. He considered the *gosudarstvmnik* position to be "deeply anti-Russian".[4]

Was Russian messianism ever a predominant influence on the formation and execution of State policy? Most tsars do not seem to have regarded the conversion of their "alien" (non-Russian) subjects to Orthodoxy and the Russian language as a high priority. The main exception was in the case of the Ukrainians, who being mainly Orthodox and culturally and linguistically close to the Russians were considered to be simply Russians, and forbidden to use their language in the press, Church, school or drama. The emphasis on the benefits of the Russian language and "fusion" favoured by revolutionaries such as Pestel and Lenin resulted not primarily from any Russian messianism, but from a Jacobin desire for centralism. Similarly, the administrative centralism pursued by Catherine II reflected a quest for efficiency rather than ideology. Russification only became of general importance under Alexander III and Nicholas II. Prior to this, the Russian government was usually happy to rule in alliance with Muslim mullahs and Lutheran German nobles. It was perhaps only in a country where not only was the monarchy of predominantly foreign extraction (not an unusual phenomenon), but where the rulers often preferred to speak in a foreign language (French or English), that the concept of *narodnost'* would have to be proclaimed

so insistently. The dismissal of Uvarov by Nicholas I symbolized the unwillingness of the regime to make concessions to the people whose spirit it had claimed to reflect.

The Jews were the only group under tsarism who suffered persecution solely by virtue of their religion—first, by being physically excluded from Russia, then by attempts at forced conversion and, finally, by pogroms. Whether or not Russians believed themselves to be the chosen people, they had no doubt that the Jews had no right to consider themselves such. Russians of profoundly different beliefs such as Pobedonostsev, Ivan Aksakov and even, on occasion, some of the narodniks, all came out against the Jews. Both late tsarist and Soviet politicians (from the 1930s) also saw the advantages of using the Jews as a scapegoat for the failings of their own political systems.

The concept of the Russian people as the leading people of the USSR, proclaimed by Stalin, reversed Lenin's nationality policy and sought support for the system primarily from the Russian people. In the Brezhnev period, the central position of the Russians became an integral part of the official ideology, with lavish praise being given to the Russian people, the Russian language promoted as never before, and the top Party and State bodies being predominantly and increasingly staffed with Russians.

In foreign affairs, the tsars normally put the interests of the State and the dynasty over those of the nation. The "Holy Alliance" was not a body to promote Orthodoxy but was to protect the interests of the empires, and in particular the emperors, of Europe. The emphasis on dynastic legitimism did not exclude the possibility of posing as the defender of the rights of Orthodox subjects outside Russia in attempts to put pressure on neighbouring empires. The only occasion when the desire to help fellow Orthodox Slavs became a dominant factor in Russian foreign policy was in 1877–8, when the pressure of public opinion spilt over into the tsarist bureaucracy. After 1917, Russian messianism was expressed in the view that it was essential to spread the revolution around the world, and also in the opposing view that it was necessary to consolidate the revolution in one country. Soviet leaders since Stalin naturally sought to expand the world influence of the USSR, whilst avoiding a military conflict with the capitalist countries and China. It is not easy to determine whether this expansionist urge was primarily defensive in origin, or whether it arose from an aggressive desire to assert the power and authority of the USSR. It might be the case that the Soviet leaders, having perceived the weakness of the USA after Vietnam and of China after the Cultural Revolution, pragmatically took opportunities to expand their influence in the way that the leaders of any great power in the past might have done, without any particular ideological motivation, "Russian" or "communist".

While Brezhnev may have seen the invasion of Afghanistan in defensive terms, military leaders and *gosudarstvmnik* writers such as Kozhinov and Prokhanov saw it differently. The multinational Russian State (tsarist and Soviet) has been engaged in a centuries-old struggle for the "Russian idea", against enemies such as cosmopolitanism, Zionism and freemasonry. At the end of his

life, Dostoevsky had predicted a shift of Russian attention from Europe to Asia. Russia by the end of 1978, while seeming unable to make gains in Europe, faced the combined hostility of Japan, China and the USA. (In August 1978 China and Japan, with American encouragement, signed a treaty directed against the USSR; in December the USA and China announced their readiness to normalize relations.) Russia, in the words of Kuznetsov's verse, "turning her back on the West" (see p. 112) proceeded to strengthen her position in the East. The invasion of Afghanistan then appears as the natural extension of the efforts of General Skobelev to subdue the Central Asians.

Seeing the cost of the policies of external confrontation and internal repression, Gorbachev sought to reorient the USSR towards the West and introduce political and economic reform. *Glasnost*' and *perestroika* both revealed and exacerbated the problems of the Brezhnev legacy. Gorbachev's final withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1989 and his agreement to the self-determination of Eastern Europe late in the same year encouraged nationalists in the non-Russian republics. In the RSFSR, politics polarized between reformers led by Eltsin who wanted to move faster than Gorbachev and an alliance of *gosudarstvenniki,* conservative Communists and Russian nationalists who wished to preserve the USSR and protect Russia from Western influences. The ideological foundations for such an alliance had been laid in the Brezhnev era, in *Molodaia gvardiia, Nash sovremennik* and *Veche*. The *gosudarstvenniki* instigated the coup of August 1991, the defeat of which by Eltsin and Gorbachev was ultimately followed by the dissolution of the Union.

The major role played by Eltsin and the institutions of the Russian Republic in the rejection of the idea of empire represented the defeat of ideological messianism by the Russians themselves. Those who rejected the policies of Westernization and clung to the idea of empire, be it Russian or Soviet, fought back bitterly against the new Russian administration, both inside and outside parliament. The National Salvation Front drew together a large part of the opposition, both Communist and nationalist. After Eltsin violently suppressed the Russian parliament in September-October 1993, it was Zhirinovsky who capitalized best on the mood of national humiliation. By 1995, however, the CPRF led by Ziuganov with his *gosudarstvennik* ideology which drew eclectically but powerfully from imperialism, Slavophilism, Marxism-Leninism and Stalinist nostalgia dominated the opposition and emerged as the clear victor in the State Duma elections. His ideas drew from those articulated during the Brezhnev era in samizdat, by people such as Mikhail Antonov in *Veche* and Gennady Shimanov. Ziuganov's messianism was not about world revolution but it emphasized Russia's uniqueness and focused on the voluntary restoration of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, the following year the voters of Russia, faced with a choice between Ziuganov and Eltsin as President, rejected a return to the Communist past and re-elected Eltsin (who had, admittedly, borrowed some of his opponents' clothes).

Central to Russian messianism is the idea of redemption through suffering. The suffering can be that of the peasants under serfdom, the Old Believers under an "Antichrist" Tsar, or the Russian people under Communism. The "victim mentality" has been further strengthened by the experience of repeated invasions, an experience Russia has shared with most of the East European peoples, from the Poles to the Serbs. These have their own messianisms, but Russians, unlike the other East Europeans, have the consciousness of belonging to what is (or should be) a major world power.

A mighty country, located at the border of Europe and Asia, Russia is seen as having protected humanity against threats emanating from both, and paying a huge price in the process. It protected Europe from the Tatar-Mongol hordes, underwent assaults from Poles and Swedes, and defended Europe against Napoleon. After the October Revolution, it suffered the Wars of Allied Intervention but then recovered and defeated Nazism. By its peaceful policy it prevented the Cold War from developing into a nuclear war. At the same time Russia sacrificed its own development for that of the Soviet periphery, the socialist countries and assorted Third World regimes. Since the development of *perestroika,* Russia faced growing Western influence, the aggressive nationalism of the non-Russian republics, resurgent Islam, and finally the collapse of the Soviet Union. The Russian Federation has faced threats to its own territorial integrity from the Caucasus, the criminalization of the State, the transformation from a military and industrial superpower to a supplier of raw materials to the West, the enlargement of NATO and what is seen as the American desire for world domination. But, for adherents of Russian messianism, Russia has its own inner strength, its spirituality, and will revive as a great power, creating its own social model.

Elements in the above picture are contradictory; it might be difficult, for example, to see the Russian people as suffering both from the effects of Allied Intervention against Communism and from Communism itself. But many elements would find resonance with many Russians today: in society at large, in the Communist and nationalist opposition, in the Moscow Patriarchate, the Armed Forces and even within the Eltsin regime.

Alternatively, one might see Russian messianism as an example of collective paranoia: on the one hand, a persecution complex, linked to the memories of being invaded, and more recently to a fever of conspiracy theories, centring on world Jewry or the CIA, and to the fear of being excluded from Europe; on the other hand, the delusions of grandeur, typified by "Moscow, the Third Rome" and the belief in the October Revolution as the first step towards world Communism. At the same time, it seems that defensiveness was usually stronger in Russia than aggressive expansion. Muscovy expanded to protect itself from outside attack. In the Cold War, Eastern Europe was a buffer zone rather than a springboard for further conquest. Lenin's call to defend the socialist fatherland was far more persuasive than Brezhnev's call to give fraternal aid to Afghanistan.

Even when guided by a messianist ideology, Russia's leaders usually were susceptible to pragmatic pressures.

Nevertheless, every attempt by Russian rulers to impose a messianist ideology on society was harmful. It led to censorship, the limitation of free discussion and the imprisonment, exile or murder of dissidents. In the case of Communism, the imposition of central planning led to economic damage from which the country has still not recovered. Central planning may have created a machine which could defeat Nazism, but it was at a terrible human cost. Attempts to impose *sobornost*' from above will come up against the strong desire among many Russians for individualism. This does not mean that the slavish copying of Western models is a solution for Russia either. The enforced Westernization of Gaidar and the IMF in 1992 was a social and economic disaster since it did not take Russian reality into account. At the onset of the third millennium, Russia is not a model for anyone else to follow. Faced with long-term economic decline and corruption permeating the State from top to bottom, reformers and Communists alike are primarily concerned with the problems of Russia itself, and certainly not with those outside the frontiers of the FSU.

Despite the experiences of the 1990s, the majority of the Russian elite and of the population wish not only to co-operate with Europe and the West but also to be accepted by Western countries and international institutions as a full and influential member of the world community. NATO enlargement has encouraged fears about the hostility of the West to Russia. If Russia is not to be forced back into the isolation of the Cold War, the West must respect Russia and assist democratization and reform for the benefit of the people of the country. One can predict with some confidence, however, that for a socio-economic model to work effectively, it will not simply duplicate Western practices but will reflect also the cultural, historical and political traditions of Russia.

Notes

Introduction

1 See Andrzej Walicki, *Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism: The Case of Poland* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1994).
2 See Branimir Anzulovic, *Heavenly Serbia: From Myth to Genocide* (London, 1999).
3 Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992).
4 George Schöpflin, "The functions of myth and a taxonomy of myths", in *Myths and Nationhood,* (eds) Geoffrey Hosking and George Schöpflin (London, 1997), pp. 29–32.
5 Geoffrey Hosking, *Russia: People and Empire 1552–1917* (London, 1997), pp. xix–xxi.
6 Anatol Lieven, "The weakness of Russian nationalism", *Survival,* XLI, No. 2 (Summer 1999), 53–70.
7 See particularly, John B.Dunlop, *The Faces of Contemporary Russian Nationalism* (Princeton N.J., 1983); also Dunlop, *The Rise of Russia and the Fall of the Soviet Empire* (Princeton, N.J., 1993).
8 See bibliography.
9 Alexander Yanov, *Détente after Brezhnev: The Domestic Roots of Soviet Foreign Policy* (Berkeley, Cal., 1977); also Yanov, *The Russian New Right: Right-Wing Ideologies in the Contemporary USSR* (Berkeley, Cal., 1978); Yanov, *The Russian Challenge and the Year 2000* (Oxford, 1987).

1
The origins of Russian messianism

1 R.J.Zwi Werblowsky, "Messiah and messianic movements", in *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* 15th edn (Chicago, 1974), Macropaedia, XI, p. 1017.
2 Hans Kohn, "Messianism", *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences,* (New York, 1933), X:356.
3 Yonina Talmon, "Millenarian movements", *AES,* VII, No. 2 (1966):159. This article (pp. 159–200) is useful for its citations of the major studies of millenarianism and messianism published before 1966.

4 Vladimir S.Solovyov, "Messianizm", *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'* (Brockhaus-Efron, SPb., 1896), XIX:150.
5 Father Superior Gennady Eikalovich, "Chto takoe 'messianizm'? (Prolog k Russkomu Messianizmu)", GZ, 1979, No. 13, p. 27.
6 Nikolai A.Berdiaev, *Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov* (M., 1912), p. 209, as cited in the 1969 samizdat anthology "Metanoia". See V.Gorsky (pseud.), "Russkii messianizm i novoe natsional'noe soznanie", *AS 899,* in *Vestnik,* No. 97 (1970), p. 35.
7 Gershom G.Scholem, "Toward an understanding of the messianic idea in Judaism", trans. Michael A.Meyer, in Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York, 1971), pp. 1, 4–6; Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (Oxford, 1959), p. 7.
8 Daniel vii, 27.
9 Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Messianism in Medieval and Reformation Europe and its Bearing on Modern Totalitarian Movements* (London, 1962), pp. 3–4.
10 Gennady Eikalovich, "Evreiskii messianizm", *Vestnik,* No. 121 (1977), pp. 103–5.
11 Matthew x, 23, and xvi, 28.
12 Cohn, *Pursuit,* pp. 6–14; Y.Talmon, "Millenarian movements", pp. 162–3.
13 See Bernard S.Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism* (London, 1972), pp. 37, 53.
14 See Boyd C.Shafer, *Faces of Nationalism: New Realities and Old Myths* (New York, 1972), p. 155.
15 See Edmund Wilson, *To the Finland Station: A Study in the Writing and Acting of History,* rev. edn (n.p., 1974), p. 38.
16 See Jacob L.Talmon, *Political Messianism: The Romantic Phase* (London, 1960), p. 265.
17 See Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology,* 2nd edn (New York, 1960), p. 40.
18 Adam Mickiewicz, *Books of the Polish Nation and its Pilgrimage* (1831), as cited in Anthony D.Smith, *Nationalism in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford, 1979), p. 199, n. 18.
19 See Hans Kohn, *Prophets and Peoples: Studies in Nineteenth Century Nationalism* (New York, 1946), especially pp. 2–9; also Shafer, *Faces,* p. 155.
20 Trans. in Cyril Toumanoff, "Moscow the Third Rome: genesis and significance of a politico-religious idea", *Catholic Historical Review,* XL, (1954–5), 438. Nikolay Andreyev has argued that Filofei had advanced the "Third Rome" theory earlier, around 1500–1, in a letter to Tsar Ivan III. This letter is, however, generally considered to have been written to Tsar Ivan IV, the successor of Vasily III; this position is defended by N.Maslennikova. See Nikolay Andreyev, "Filkofei and his Epistle to Ivan Vasil'yevich", *SEER,* XXXVIII, No. 90 (December 1959), 1–31; and (for Maslennikova's view), Ia.S.Lure, *Ideologicheskaia bor'ba v russkoi publitsistike kontsa XV—nachala XVI veka* (M.-L., 1960), pp. 346–57, 482–97, cited in James H.Billington, *The Icon and the Axe: An Interpretive History of Russian Culture* (New York, 1970), p. 650, n. 46.
21 See Dimitri Stremooukhoff, "Moscow the Third Rome: sources of the doctrine", *Speculum,* XXVIII, No. 1 (January 1953), 85.
22 See Billington, *The Icon and The Axe* (n. 20 above), p. 11.

23 Iu.M.Lotman and B.A.Uspensky, "Otzvuki kontseptsii 'Moskva—tretii Rim' v ideologii Petra Pervogo (K probleme srednevekovoi traditsii v kul'ture barokko)", in *Khudozjiestvennyi iazyk srednevekov'ia,* ed. V.A.Karpushchin (Moscow, 1982), p. 238.

24 See Robert L.Wolff, "The three Romes: the migration of an ideology and the making of an autocrat", *Daedalus,* LXXXVIII, No. 2 (Spring 1959), 298; Toumanoff, "Moscow", p. 435; also Michael Cherniavsky, "The reception of the Council of Florence in Moscow", *Church History,* XXIV (1955), 347–59; Dmitry Obolensky, "Russia's Byzantine heritage", *Oxford Slavonic Papers,* I (1950), 40.

25 Iu.A.Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyi obzor drevne- russkikh polemicheskikh sochinenii protiv Latiniian* (M., 1875), pp. 394–95, as cited in Wolff, "The three Romes", p. 299.

26 See Michael Cherniavsky, *"Khan* or *Basileus:* an aspect of Russian mediaeval political theory", JHI, XX, No. 4 (October–December 1959), pp. 465–66; Stremooukhoff, "Moscow", pp. 88–91 (quotation, p. 91).

27 See David B.Miller, "The Velikie Minei Chetii and the Stepennaia Kniga of Metropolitan Makarii and the origins of Russian national consciousness", *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte,* XXVI (1979), 263–382.

28 See Nicolas Zernov, *Moscow the Third Rome* (London, 1937), pp. 54–77; Aleksandr V Solovyov, *Holy Russia: The History of a Religious-Social Idea* (The Hague, 1959), p. 36 (Church Council quotation); Geoffrey Hosking, *Russia: People and Empire 1552–1917* (London, 1997), pp. 66–8.

29 See Pierre Kovalevsky, "Messianisme et Millénarisme russes?", *Archives de sociologie des religions,* No. 5 (January–June 1958), p. 50.

30 See Stephen L.Baehr, "From history to national myth: *Translatio imperil* in eighteenth-century Russia", *RR,* XXXVII, No. 1 (January 1978), 1–13.

31 See N.S.Chaev," 'Moskva—Tretii Rim' v politicheskoi praktike moskovskogo pravitel'stva XVI veka", *Istoricheskie zapiski,* XVII (1945), 22–3.

32 See Henry R.Huttenbach, "The origins of Russian imperialism", in Tomas Hunczak (ed.) *Russian Imperialism from Ivan the Great to the Revolution,* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1974), pp. 26–30.

33 See John L.I.Fennell, *Ivan the Great of Moscow* (London, 1961), pp. 211–16.

34 Emanuel Sarkisyanz, "Russian imperialism reconsidered", in Hunczak (ed.) *Russian Imperialism,* pp. 51–2.

35 For an attempt to discover the views of the peasants in the second half of the nineteenth century, see Daniel Field, *Rebels in the Name of the Tsar* (Boston, Mass., 1976).

36 See Michael Cherniavsky," 'Holy Russia': a study in the history of an idea", *AHR,* LXIII, No. 3 (April 1958), 620.

37 Andrei M.Kurbsky, *The Correspondence between Prince A.M.Kurbsky and Tsar Ivan IV of Russia, 1564–1579,* John L.I.Fennell (ed and trans.) (Cambridge, 1955), p. 3 (my interpolations). Edward L.Keenan has denied the authenticity of this correspondence in his *The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha: The Seventeenth-Century Genesis of the "Correspondence" Attributed to Prince A.M.Kurbskii and Tsar Ivan IV* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971). Ruslan G.Skrynnikov of Leningrad State University opposed Keenan in his *Perepiska Groznogo i Kurbskogo: Paradoksy Edvarda Kinana* (Leningrad, 1973). The scholarly discussion was summarized in Skrynnikov, "On the authenticity of the Kurbskii-Groznyi correspondence: a

summary of the discussion", trans. G.Edward Orchard, *SR,* XXXVII, No. 1 (March 1978), pp. 107–15. In 1979 the USSR Academy of Sciences published a new edition of the correspondence prepared by Ia.S.Lure and Iu.D.Rykov under the editorship of Academician Dmitry S. Likhachev. This included a defence of the authenticity of the text: Lure and Rykov, "Arkheograficheskii obzor", in *Perepiska Ivana Groznogo s Andreem Kurbskim* (Leningrad, 1979), pp. 250–352. Another rebuttal of Keenan was Niels Rossing and Birgit Rønne, *Apocryphal—Not Apocryphal? A Critical Analysis of the Discussion concerning the Correspondence between Tsar Ivan IV Groznyj and Prince Andrej Kurbsky* (Copenhagen, 1980).

38 Kurbsky, reply to Ivan's second epistle, as cited in Cherniavsky, "Holy Russia" (see n. 36 above), p. 620.

39 Nikolai Valentinov, "O russkom messianizme", *NZh,* No. 90 (1968), p. 256.

40 See Maureen Perrie, *Pretenders and Popular Monarchism in Early Modern Russia: The False Tsars of the Times of Troubles* (Cambridge, 1995).

41 See Billington, *The Icon and The Axe* (n. 20 above), pp. 174–97; Kovalevsky, "Messianisme et Millénarisme russes?" (see n. 29), pp. 52–6.

42 See Nikolai A.Berdiaev, *The Russian Idea,* trans. R.M.French (London, 1947), pp. 11–12.

43 Robert C.Tucker, "The image of dual Russia", in Cyril E.Black (ed.) *The Transformation of Russian Society: Aspects of Social Change since 1861,* (Cambridge, Mass., 1960), p. 588.

44 S.O.Yakobson, "The rise of Russian nationalism", in E.H.Carr *et al. Nationalism: A Report by a Study Group of Members of the Royal Institute of International Affairs,* (London, 1939), pp. 57–66 (quotation, p. 62). See also Helen Y.Prochazka, "On concepts of patriotism, loyalty and honour in the old Russian military accounts", *SEER,* LXIII, No. 4 (October 1985), 481–97.

45 See Hans Rogger, *National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia* (Cambridge, Mass., 1960), pp. 1–7, 276.

46 Charles Ruud, "Pre-Revolutionary Russian Nationalism", *CRSN,* I, No. 2 (Spring 1974), 276.

47 See Richard Pipes, *Karamzin's Memoir on Ancient and Modern Russia: A Translation and Analysis,* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), pp. 147–56.

48 *Ibid.,* pp. 120–7 (quotation, p. 123).

49 Nikolai M.Karamzin, *Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskago* (reprinted The Hague, 1969).

50 Kovalevsky, "Messianisme et Millénarisme russes?" (see n. 29), pp. 58–9.

2
The Slavophils and Russian messianism under Nicholas I

1 Sergei S.Uvarov, "Tsirkuliarnoe predlozhenie G.Upravliaiushchego Ministerstvom Narodnogo Prosveshcheniia Nachal'stvam Uchebnykh Okrugov 'o vstuplenii v upravlenie Ministerstvom'", *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniia,* 1834, Pt I, p. 1, as cited in Nicholas V.Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825–1855* (Berkeley, Cal., 1959), p. 73.

2 Riasanovsky, *Nicholas,* pp. 137–8, 181, 274–5; V.V.Zenkovsky, *Russian Thinkers and European* Arbor, Mich., 1953), pp. 41–2.

3 Nicholas V.Riasanovsky, *Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles: A Study of Romantic Ideology* (Cambridge, Mass., 1952), pp. 1–22.
4 Vladimir F.Odoevsky, *Russkie nochi* (L., 1975). This is discussed in V.I.Sakharov, "Dvizhushchaiasia estetika V.F.Odoevskogo", in Vladimir F.Odoevsky, *0 literature i iskusstve,* ed. and intro. Sakharov (M., 1982), pp. 11–15.
5 Odoevsky, as cited in Zenkovsky, *Russian Thinkers,* p. 18. See also Neil Cornwell, *The Life, Times and Milieu of V.F.Odoevsky, 1804–1869,* foreword Isaiah Berlin (London, 1986).
6 Andzrej Walicki, *A History of Russian Thought: From the Enlightenment to Marxism,* (Stanford, 1979) p. 91.
7 Pyotr Ia.Chaadaev, *The Major Works of Peter Chaadaev: A Translation and Commentary,* comp. Raymond T.McNally (Notre Dame, Ind., 1969), pp. 23–51.
8 *Ibid.,* p. 24.
9 *Ibid.,* p. 27.
10 *Ibid.,* pp. 32–3, 37–8.
11 Pyotr la.Chaadaev, letter to Aleksandr I.Turgenev, 1 May 1835, *Sochineniia i pis'ma P.Ia.Chaadaeva,* ed.Mikhail O.Gershenzon (2 vols., M., 1913–1914), I, 185, as trans. in *The Mind of Modern Russia: Historical and Political Thought of Russia's Great Age,* ed. Hans Kohn (New Brunswick, N.J., 1955), p. 50.
12 Chaadaev, *Major Works,* pp. 199–218 (quotation, p. 205).
13 *Ibid.,* pp. 213–14.
14 Joseph Frank, "The Road to Revolution", *TLS,* 19 November 1981, p. 1332.
15 This has drawn in particular on the following discussions of Chaadaev: Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, *A Parting of Ways: Government and the Educated Public in Russia, 1801–1855* (Oxford, 1976), pp. 167–76; Andrzej Walicki, *The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth Century Russian Thought* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 83–117; *Mind of Modern Russia,* ed. Kohn, pp. 34–57. See also Raymond T.McNally, *Chaadayev and his Friends: An Intellectual History of Peter Chaadayev and his Russian Contemporaries* (Tallahassee, Fla., 1971).
16 Walter N.Vickery, "Pushkin: Russia and Europe", in "Russia: The Spirit of Nationalism", ed. Charles A.Moser, special issue of *Review of National Literatures,* III, No. 1 (Spring 1972), 17.
17 Aleksandr S.Pushkin, "Klevetnikam Rossii", *Sochineniia v trekh tomakh,* ed. A.Saakiants (M., 1962), I, 317.
18 Nikolai V.Gogol, "Vybrannye mesta iz perepiski s druz'iami", *Sob. soch, v semi tomakh,* ed. S.I.Mashinsky, N.L.Stepanova and M.B.Khrapchenko (M., 1966–7), VI, 202–421.
19 Gogol, "Vybrannye mesta", pp. 233–5, 412–21 (quotation, p. 421).
20 Gogol, as cited in Zenkovsky, *Russian Thinkers,* p. 38.
21 Gogol, "Vybrannye mesta", p. 420.
22 Gogol, as cited in Zenkovsky, *Russian Thinkers,* p. 38.
23 Peter K.Christoff, *An Introduction to Nineteenth-Century Russian Slavophilism: A Study in Ideas,* I, *A.S.Xomjakov* (The Hague, 1961), p. 8.
24 Marc Raeff, "Analyzing the realm of a Russian Utopia", *CASS,* XI, No. 3 (February 1977), 433, 436.
25 Thomas C.Owen, *Capitalism and Politics in Russia: A Social History of the Moscow Merchants, 1855–1905 (*Cambridge, 1981), p. 11.

26 Zenkovsky, *Russian Thinkers,* p. 40.
27 Riasanovsky, *Parting,* pp. 177–8 (phrases quoted); Walicki, *Slavophile Controversy,* pp. 188–200.
28 Aleksei S.Khomiakov, "Po povodu Gumbol'dta", *PSS Alekseia Stepanovicha Khomiakova,* 2nd edn., I (M., 1878), 143–74 (quotation, p. 148).
29 Khomiakov, "Sovremennyi vopros", *PSS,* 4th edn. (8 vols., M., 1900–1914), III, 290.
30 Khomiakov, "Mechta" (1834), *PSS,* 4th edn., IV, 27.
31 Khomiakov, "Po povodu Gumbol'dta", *PSS,* 2nd edn., I, 172–74 (quotation, p. 174).
32 Ivan V Kireevsky, "O kharaktere prosveshcheniia Evropy i o ego otnoshenii k prosveshcheniiu Rossii (Pis'mo k gr. E.E.Komarovskomu)", in *Rannie slavianofily.A.S. Khomiakov, I.V.Kireevskii, K.S. i I.S. Aksakovy,* comp. Nikolai L.Brodsky (M., 1910), pp. 1–50.
33 *Ibid.,* p. 9.
34 *Ibid.,* p. 12.
35 *Ibid.,* pp. 1–21.
36 For discussion of the early development of Konstantin Aksakov's views, see Edward Chmielewski, *Tribune of the Slavophiles: Konstantin Aksakov* (Gainesville, Fla., 1962), pp. 24–32; Peter K.Christoff, *An Introduction to Nineteenth-Century Russian Slavophilism,* III, *K.S.Aksakov: A Study in Ideas* (Princeton, N.J., 1982), especially pp. 296–303; Walicki, *Slavophile Controversy,* pp. 242, 289–300.
37 Konstantin S.Aksakov, "Petru", in *Rannie slavianofily,* comp. Brodsky (n. 32), pp. 165–8 (quotations, pp. 165, 168).
38 Aksakov, in *Moskovskii literaturnyi i uchenyi sbornik na 1847 god* (M., 1847), p. 22, as cited in Christoff (n. 36), *Aksakov,* p. 302.
39 Aksakov, "Semisotletie Moskvy", *PSS,* (3 vols., M., 1861–1880), I, *Sochineniia istoricheskie,* 598–605 (quotation, p. 604).
40 Aksakov, *Sochineniia istorieheskie,* p. 630, as cited in Riasanovsky (n. 3), *Russia and the West,* p. 121.
41 Christoff, *Aksakov,* pp. 227, 232–33, 246–48; Walicki, *Slavophile Controversy,* p. 496.
42 Mikhail P.Pogodin, "Letter on Russian History", trans. in *Mind of Modern Russia,* ed. Kohn, pp. 60–68.
43 Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology,* 2nd edn., rev. (New York, 1960), pp. 140–6.
44 Fyodor I.Tiutchev, "Kak doch' rodnuiu na zaklan'e", *Izbrannye stikhotvoreniia* (New York, 1952), pp. 212–13.
45 Tiutchev, "Russkaia geografiia", *PSS,* 6th edn., intro. Valery Ia. Briusov (SPb., n.d. [after 1900]), p. 292.
46 Frank L.Fadner, *Seventy Years of Pan-Slavism in Russia: Karazin to Danilevskii, 1800–1870* (Washington, D.C., 1962), p. 283 (including quotation from "Prophecy"); Richard A. Gregg, *Fedor Tiutchev: The Evolution of a Poet* (New York, 1965), p. 123, has extracts from "Dawn" in Russian. In pp. 119–24 he discusses Tiutchev's pan-Slavism up to the Crimean War.
47 Richard Hare, *Pioneers of Russian Social Thought* (London, 1951), p. 133.
48 Fyodor I.Tiutchev, "La Russie et la Revolution", excerpts in *Mind of Modern Russia,* ed. Kohn, pp. 94–103.

49 Riasanovsky, *Nicholas,* pp. 163–4, 229–48; Christoff, *Aksakov,* pp. 237–45.
50 Riasanovsky, *Russia and the West,* p. 154; Michael B.Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Pan-Slavism, 1856–1870* (New York, 1956), pp. 104–106, 110; Christoff, *Xomjakov,* pp. 53, 91 (Zakrevsky), and Peter K.Christoff, *An Introduction to Nineteenth-Century Russian Slavophilism: A Study in Ideas,* II, *I.V.Kireevskij* (The Hague, 1972), p. 116.
51 Riasanovsky, *Russia and the West,* p. 44.
52 Riasanovsky, *Russia and the West,* pp. 44–46; Abbott Gleason, *European and Muscovite: Ivan Kireevsky and the Origins of Slavophilism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), pp. 226, 232–35; Charles A.Ruud, *Fighting Words: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804–1906* (Toronto, 1982), pp. 83–96.
53 Mikhail P.Pogodin, *Istoriko-politicheskie pis'ma i zapiski v prodolzhenii Krymskoi Voiny, 1853–1856* (M., 1874), p. 259, as cited in Riasanovsky, *Nicholas,* p. 219 (final quotation).
54 Fyodor I.Tiutchev, "Lettres de Th.I.Tjutscheff a sa seconde epouse, nee Baronne de Pfeffel", *Starina i novizna,* XIX (1915), 109, 106, as cited in Gregg, p. 124 (quotations); Philip M.Walters, "The two abysses: some reflections on ambiguous Russian attitudes to the West, with Reference to S.N.Bulgakov, V.S.Solovev and F.I.Tyutchev", *Sobornost,* Series VI, No. 10 (Winter 1974), pp. 731–2.
55 Chmielewski, *Tribune,* p. 47; Christoff, *Aksakov,* pp. 268–71.
56 Christoff, *Kireevskij,* p. 257.
57 Khomiakov's "Rossii" poems are in *Rannie slavianofily,* comp. Brodsky, pp. 150–51 (1839), 160 (1854). Brodsky's comment is at *Rannie slavianofily,* p. 159.
58 *Rannie slavianofily,* p. 160 (poem); Brodsky, in *ibid.,* p. 159 (Khomiakov's comment). See also Christoff, *Xomjakov,* pp. 105–6.
59 Aleksandr Yanov, *The Russian Challenge and the Year 2000* (Oxford, 1987).

3
Pro-tsarist forms of Russian messianism

1 Konstantin S.Aksakov, "O vnutrennem sostoianii Rossii", in *Rannie slavianofily. A.S. Khomiakov, I.V.Kireevskii, K.S. i I.S.Aksakovy,* comp. Nikolai L.Brodsky (M., 1910), pp. 69–96.
2 *Ibid.,* pp. 84–9.
3 *Ibid.,* pp. 95–6 (quotations).
4 Nikolai I.Tsimbaev, "Zapiska K.S.Aksakova 'O vnutrennem sostoianii Rossii' i ee mesto v ideologii slavianofil'stva", *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. Istoriia,* 1972, No. 2, p. 53.
5 Peter K.Christoff, *An Introduction to Nineteenth-Century Russian Slavophilism: Iu.F.Samarin* (Boulder, Colo., 1991).
6 Michael B.Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Panslavism, 1856–1870* (New York, 1956), pp. 132–9 (quotation, pp. 138–9); Tomas Hunczak, "Pan-Slavism or Pan-Russianism", in *Russian Imperialism from Ivan the Great to the Revolution,* ed. Tomas Hunczak (New Brunswick, N.J., 1974) p. 93.
7 Written in 1866. In Fyodor I.Tiutchev, *Izbrannye stikhotvoreniia* (New York, 1952), p. 243.

8 A full translation of the text is in Peter K.Christoff, *An Introduction to Nineteenth-Century Russian Slavophilism: A Study in Ideas,* I, *A.S.Xomjakov,* pp. 247–68.
9 Nikolai I.Tsimbaev, *I.S.Aksakov v obshchestvennoi zhizni porefarmennoi Rossii* (M., 1978), pp. 69–71. For a detailed discussion of *Den',* see *ibid.,* pp. 68–126.
10 *Den',* 15 October 1861, in Ivan S.Aksakov, *Sochineniia I.S.Aksakova* (3 vols., M, 1886–1891), I, *Slavianstii vopros 1860–1886. Stat'i iz "Dnia", "Moskvy" i "Rusi". Rechi v Slavianskom Komitete v 1876, 1877 i 1878,* p. 6 (Aksakov's emphasis).
11 From the many biographies of Dostoevsky, for his life up to 1871, see in particular Joseph Frank, *Dostoevsky: The Seeds of Revolt, 1821–1849, Dostoevsky: The Years of Ordeal, 1850–1859, Dostoevsky: The Stir of Liberation, 1860–1865* (Princeton, N.J., 1976, 1984 and 1987), and *Dostoevsky: The Miraculous Years, 1865–1871* (London, 1995). On the *pochvenniki,* see E.Wayne Dowler, *Dostoevsky, Grigor'ev and Native Soil Conservatism* (Toronto, 1982).
12 As cited in Konstantin V.Mochulsky, *Dostoevsky: His Life and Work,* (Princeton, N.J., 1967), p. 219.
13 Petrovich, *Emergence,* pp. 141–5, 258 (quotation).
14 *Moskvich,* 28 May 1868, as cited in Frank L.Fadner, *Seventy Tears of Pan-Slavism in Russia: Karazin to Danilevskii, 1800–1870* (Washington, D.C., 1962) p. 229.
15 For Ignatev, see Fadner, *Seventy Tears,* pp. 293–301, and Petrovich, *Emergence,* pp. 258–63. *Ibid,* pp. 264–81, discusses Fadeev and Danilevsky. For Fadeev, see also Fadner, *Seventy Tears,* pp. 338–49; Rostislav A.Fadeev, *Mnenie o vostochnom voprose* (SPb., 1870), trans. as *Opinion on the Eastern Question* (London, 1871).
16 Nikolai la.Danilevsky, *Rossiia i Evropa.Vzgliad na kul'turnye i politicheskie otnosheniia Slavianskogo mira k Germano-Romanskomu,* ed. Nikolai N.Strakhov (New York, 1966; a reprint of the 5th edn., SPb., 1894).
17 Strakhov, in *ibid.,* p. xx.
18 Danilevsky, *Rossiia i Evropa,* p. 525.
19 *Ibid.,* pp. 285–6 (quotation, p. 286).
20 *Ibid.,* pp. 538–9.
21 *Ibid.,* pp. 20–118, 432–73; Samuel P.Huntington, "The clash of civilizations", *Foreign Affairs,* LXXII, No. 3 (1993), 22–49. See also Robert E.MacMaster, *Danilevsky: A Russian Totalitarian Philosopher* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967).
22 Tsimbaev, *Aksakov,* p. 231.
23 *Ibid.,* pp. 231–2.
24 I. Aksakov, letter to M.G.Cherniaev, 1 November 1876, in Gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii muzei, Moscow, otdel pis'mennykh istochnikov, f. 208, ed. 42, as cited in Tsimbaev, *Aksakov,* p. 234 (Aksakov's emphasis).
25 Tsimbaev, *Aksakov,* pp. 226–46.
26 Leonid P.Grossman, "Dostoevskii i pravitel'stvennye krugi 1870-kh godov", *LN,* XV (1934), 83–162; *idem, Dostoevsky: A Biography,* trans. Mary Mockler (London, 1974), p. 557; David Goldstein, *Dostoievsky and the Jews* (Austin, Tex., 1980), pp. 90, 93–94; E.H.Carr, *Dostoevsky, 1821–1881* (London, 1963), pp. 183–94, 213–14.
27 Fyodor M.Dostoevsky, *Dnevnik pisatelia za 1877 god,* (Paris, n.d.), p. 337. This 3-volume YMCA Press edition of Dostoevsky's journalistic writings, entitled *Dnevnik pisatelia za 1873 god, za 1876god, and* za *1877god* (all Paris, n.d.), will henceforth be referred to as *DP 1873, DP 1876* and *DP 1877.* The original *Dnevnik pisatelia* will henceforth be referred to as *Dnevnik. DP 1873* includes writings from

Vremia. DP 1877 includes *Dnevnik* for 1880 and 1881. I consulted Brian Brasol's translation, *The Diary of a Writer* (2 vols., London, 1949), but all translations of Dostoevsky from Russian language citations are my responsibility

28 *Dnevnik,* August 1880, in *DP 1877,* pp. 555–6.
29 Fyodor M.Dostoevsky, "Besy", *PSS v tridtsati tomakh* (L., 1972), X, 312, 311. I consulted David Magarshack's translation, *The Devils* (Harmondsworth, Middx., 1971).
30 Fyodor M.Dostoevsky, "Brat'ia Karamazovy", *PSS,* XIV, 224–39. Again I consulted Magarshack's translation, *The Brothers Karamazov* (Harmondsworth, Middx., 1977).
31 Mochulsky, *Dostoevsky* p. 618; p. 86.
32 "Dnevnik", in *Grazhdanin,* 1873, No. 1, in *DP 1873,* p. 188.
33 See Carr, *Dostoevsky,* p. 177.
34 Dostoevsky, "Besy", *PSS,* X, 499; Philip Rahv, "Dostoevsky and politics: notes on 'The Possessed'", *PR,* V, No. 2 (July 1938), 28–9.
35 Andrzej Walicki, *Marxism and the Leap to the Kingdom of Freedom: The Rise and Fall of the Communist Utopia* (Stanford, Cal., 1995), p. 5.
36 Dostoevsky, "Brat'ia Karamazovy", *PSS,* XIV, 64–5.
37 *Idem,* "Besy", *PSS,* V, 200.
38 Dostoevsky, "Besy", *PSS,* X, 196–200.
39 *DP 1877,* pp. 22 (quotation), 26.
40 Dostoevsky, "Brat'ia Karamazovy", *PSS,* XIV, 285.
41 *Ibid.,* p. 345.
42 Carr, *Dostoevsky,* pp. 222–31; Nikolai K.Mikhailovsky, *Dostoevsky: A Cruel Talent* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1978), pp. 17, 35.
43 "Dnevnik", in *Grazhdanin,* 1873, No. 8, in *DP 1873,* p. 258.
44 Lubomir Radoyce, "Writer in Hell: Notes on Dostoevsky's Letters", *CalSS,* IX (1976), 114–16.
45 *Dnevnik,* July–August 1876, in *DP 1876,* p. 326.
46 Nikolai A.Berdiaev, *Dostoievsky* (New York, 1957), p. 160.
47 *Dnevnik,* September 1876, in *DP 1876,* pp. 363–4.
48 *Dnevnik,* June 1876, in *DP 1876,* pp. 254–6.
49 *Ibid.,* pp. 250–8 (quotation, p. 254).
50 *Dnevnik,* March 1877, in *DP 1877,* p. 88.
51 *Dnevnik,* July-August 1876, in DP 1876, p. 275; see also Goldstein, *Dostoievsky,* pp. 102–5.
52 *Dnevnik,* March 1877, in *DP 1877,* pp. 97–9.
53 Karl Marx, "Zur Judenfrage", in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Werke,* (39 vols.; hereafter *MEW*; Berlin, 1956–68), I, 374–7. At his most "Marxist" point, Dostoevsky wrote: "Capital is accumulated labour. The Jew loves to trade in other people's labour!" (*Dnevnik,* March 1877, in *DP 1877,* p. 114.)
54 Goldstein, *Dostoievsky,* p. 119.
55 *Dnevnik,* March 1877, in *DP 1877,* pp. 99–107 (quotation, p. 107).
56 *DP 1877,* p. 111.
57 *Dnevnik,* March 1877, in *DP 1877,* pp. 107–14 (quotation, p. 113).
58 *DP 1877,* pp. 115, 117.

59 Orest F.Miller and Nikolai N.Strakhov, *Biografiia, pis'ma i zametki iz zapisnykh knizhek F.M.Dostoevskogo* (SPb., 1883), p. 358 (2nd pagination), as cited in Goldstein, *Dostoievsky,* p. 153.
60 Goldstein, *Dostoievsky,* pp. 159, 163.
61 *Dnevnik,* August 1880, in DP *1877,* pp. 510–27.
62 *Ibid,* pp. 524–6.
63 *Ibid.,* p. 526.
64 Edward C.Thaden, *Conservative Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Russia* (Seattle, Wash., 1964), pp. 84–6; Andrzej Walicki, *The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth Century Russian Thought* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 551–5; Mochulsky, *Dostoevsky,* pp. 566–7.
65 Carr, *Dostoevsky,* pp. 237–40; Walicki, *Slavophile Controversy,* pp. 554–7; Radoyce, "Writer", pp. 98–9, 106.
66 *DP 1877,* pp. 585 (quotation), 589.
67 *Ibid*., p.604.
68 *Ibid.,* p. 609.
69 Emanuel Sarkisyanz, "Russian attitudes toward Asia", *RR,* XIII, No. 4 (October 1954), 248.
70 Engels, letter to Marx, 23 May 1851, in *MEW,* XXVII, 267; Engels, letter to Ion Nadejde, 4 January 1888, *MEW,* XXXVII, 5.
71 Salo W.Baron, *The Russian Jew under Tsars and Soviets,* 2nd edn. (New York, 1976), pp. 39–62; *Pogroms: Anti-Jewish Violence in Modern Russian History,* ed. John D.Klier and Shlomo Lambroza (Cambridge, 1992); Robert F.Byrnes, *Pobedonostsev: His Life and Thought* (Bloomington, Ind., 1968), pp. 202–9; Hans Rogger, *Jewish Policies and Right-Wing Politics in Imperial Russia* (London, 1986).
72 Konstantin N.Leontev, *Sochineniia,* VI, 118, as cited in Aleksandr L.Ianov, "Slavianofily i Konstantin Leont'ev (Russkaia konservativnaia mysl' XIX v. i ee interpretatory)", *VF,* 1969, No. 8, p. 99.
73 Ianov, "Slavianofily"; Walicki, *Slavophile Controversy,* pp. 523–4 (Aksakov quotation, p. 524); Hare, *Pioneers,* pp. 275–9.
74 Walicki, *Slavophile Controversy,* pp. 519–30; Hare, pp. 290–301.
75 Leontev, VI, 47–8, as cited in Ianov, "Slavianofily", p. 104.
76 Leontev, VII, 501, as cited in Ianov, "Slavianofily", p. 105, for the quotation; Walicki, *Slavophile Controversy,* p. 523; Hare, *Pioneers,* pp. 275, 301.
77 Nikolai F.Fyodorov, *Filosofiia obshchego dela,* 2 vols. (Verny, 1906 and M., 1913).
78 Fyodorov, "Filosofiia obshchego dela", *Sochineniia,* ed. and intro. Svetlana G. Semyonova (M., 1982), p. 301.
79 *Ibid.,* p. 91. My remarks on Fyodorov are based mainly on the Soviet edition of this work and on Stephen Lukashevich, *N.F.Fedorov (1828–1903): A Study in Russian Eupsychian and Utopian Thought* (Newark, Del., 1977).
80 Fyodorov, "Filosofiia", p. 173.
81 *Ibid.,* pp. 304–6; Svetlana G.Semyonova, "N.F.Fedorov i ego filosofskoe nasledie", in Fyodorov, *Sochineniia,* p. 36; Lukashevich, *Fedorov,* pp. 243–4, 256–7.
82 Fyodorov, "Filosofiia", pp. 340, 218, 472, 216.
83 Lukashevich, *Fedorov,* especially pp. 267–90.

84 For general discussions of Fyodorov's influence in the USSR, see Semyonova, "N.F. Fedorov", pp. 5–8; Sergei Voronitsyn, "Unusual Interest Shown in Long Forgotten Russian Religious Thinker", RL 64/82 (9 February 1982), in *RLRB,* 1982, No. 6.
85 Nina Tumarkin, *Lenin Lives! The Lenin Cult in Soviet Russia* (Cambridge, Mass., 1983), pp. 19, 181–2.
86 Michael Karpovich, "Vladimir Soloviev on nationalism", *RP,* VIII, No. 2 (April 1946), 188.
87 Solovyov, as cited in V.V.Zenkovsky, *Russian Thinkers and Europe* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1953), p. 175.
88 Dimitri Stremooukhoff, *Vladimir Soloviev and His Messianic Work,* ed. Philip Guilbeau and Heather E.MacGregor (Belmont, Mass., 1980), pp. 185–92, 204–5.
89 Zenkovsky, *Russian Thinkers,* p. 177.
90 Solovyov, *Pis'ma,* I, 189, as cited in Stremooukhoff, *Soloviev,* pp. 219–20.
91 Vladimir S.Solovyov, *Natsional'nyi vopros v Rossii,* vyp. II (SPb., 1891), p. 332.
92 Stremooukhoff, *Soloviev,* pp. 230–7, 241–60 (the extract from "Ex oriente lux" is on p. 243), 319–37; Sarkisyanz, "Russian attitudes", pp. 249–50; Jonathan Sutton, *The Religious Philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov: Towards a Reassessment* (Basingstoke, 1988), pp. 173–5.
93 Christopher J.Read, *Religion, Revolution and the Russian Intelligentsia, 1900–12: The* Vekhi *Debate and its Intellectual Background* (London, 1979), pp. 13–14.
94 *Vekhi. Sbornik statei o russkoi intelligentsii* (Frankfurt, 1967; a reprint of the 2nd edn., M., 1909).
95 Nikolai A.Berdiaev, "Filosofskaia istina i intelligentskaia pravda", in *Vekhi,* p. 22.
96 Sergei N.Bulgakov, "Geroizm i podvizhnichestvo (Iz razmyshlenii o religioznoi prirode russkoi intelligentsii)", in *Vekhi,* pp. 37–9. For Bulgakov's views, see also George F.Putnam, *Russian Alternatives to Marxism: Christian Socialism and Idealistic Liberalism in Twentieth-Century Russia* (Knoxville, Term., 1977), especially pp. 11, 17, 100; Gennady Eikalovich, "O nekotorykh messianskikh motivakh u S.N.Bulgakova", *NZh*, No. 152 (September 1983), pp. 284–301, especially pp. 300–1.
97 Berdiaev, "Filosofskaia istina", in *Vekhi,* pp. 17–20.
98 Bulgakov, "Geroizm", in *Vekhi,* pp. 60–2.
99 Zenkovsky, *Russian Thinkers,* pp. 180–7 (quotation, p. 185).

4
Messianism and revolution

1 Parts of this chapter are drawn from my "Changing Landmarks? Anti-Westernism in National Bolshevik and Russian Revolutionary Thought", in *Russian Nationalism: Past and Present* ed. Geoffrey Hosking and Robert Service (Basingstoke, 1998), pp. 55–76, where there is a fuller discussion of *narodnichestvo* and of the Bolsheviks' Asian orientation. I am grateful to the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, London (SSEES) for permission to reproduce these paragraphs from this volume in the Macmillan/SSEES series *Studies in Russia and East Europe.*

2 Abbott Gleason, *Young Russia: The Genesis of Russian Radicalism in the 1860s* (Chicago, 1983), p. 53.
3 Aleksandr I.Herzen, "Dnevnik", 24 January 1844, *Sob. soch. v tridtsati tomakh* (M., 1954–1965), II, 328.
4 *Ibid.,* 21 February 1844, II, 336.
5 Martin E.Malia, *Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism, 1812–1855* (Cambridge, Mass., 1961), pp. 300–11, 463–4; Franco Venturi, R*oots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in Nineteenth Century Russia* (New York, 1966), pp. 1–21; Edward Acton, *Alexander Herzen and the Role of the Intellectual Revolutionary* (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 11–14, 19; Jacob L.Talmon, *The Myth of the Nation and the Vision of Revolution: The Origins of Intellectual Polarization in the Twentieth Century* (London, 1981), pp. 257–9.
6 Herzen, "La Russie", 25 August 1849, *Sob. soch.,* VI, 162–3.
7 Aleksandr Herzen, "Le peuple russe et le socialisme", 22 September 1851, *Sob. soch.,* VII, 285–92 (quotation, p. 288).
8 Karl Marx, "Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie. Einleitung" (1843–1844), *MEW,* I, 390–91 (Marx's emphasis).
9 Friedrich Engels, in Karl Marx, *The Revolutions of 1848,* ed. and intro. David Fernbach (Harmondsworth, Middx., 1973), p. 65 (*MEW,* XXI, 357).
10 Walter Benjamin, "Theses on the philosophy of history" (written 1940), *Illuminations,* ed. Hannah Arendt (London, 1992), p.251.
11 Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, "Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei", *MEW,* IV, 479, 493.
12 Friedrich Engels, "Der Prager Aufstand", *Neue Rheinische Zeitung,* 18 June 1848, *MEW,* V, 80.
13 Engels, "Der magyarische Kampf", *Neue Rheinische fitting,* 13 January 1849, *MEW,* VI, 168.
14 Horace B.Davis, *Nationalism and Socialism: Marxist and Labor Theories of Nationalism to 1917* (New York, 1967), pp. 50–1. Michael Levin makes a similar point in his "Deutschmarx: Marx, Engels and the German Question", *PS,* XXIX, No. 4 (December 1981), 553.
15 Solomon E Bloom, *The World of Nations: A Study of the National Implications in the Work of Karl Marx* (New York, 1967), p. 194.
16 Friedrich Engels, "Der demokratische Panslavismus", *Neue Rheinische Zeitung,* 15 and 16 February 1849, *MEW,* VI, 270–86 (quotation, p. 286).
17 Karl Marx to Engels, 20 July 1870, *MEW,* XXXIII, 5.
18 Engels, "Der Sozialismus in Deutschland", *MEW,* XXII, 253–6; Talmon, *Myth,* pp. 21–66; Davis, *Nationalism,* especially pp. 36–51; Edmund Wilson, *To the Finland Station: A Study in the Writing and Acting of History,* rev. edn. (n.p., 1974), pp. 230–7; Charles C. Herod, *The Nation in the History of Marxian Thought: The Concept of Nations with History and Nations without History* (The Hague, 1976); Ian Cummins, *Marx, Engels and National Movements* (London, 1980); Vladimir C.Fišera and Gunter Minnerup, "Marx, Engels and the national question", in *Socialism and Nationalism,* ed. Eric Cahm and Vladimir C.Fišera (3 vols., Nottingham, 1978–80), pp. 5–19.
19 Karl Marx, letter to *Otechestvennye zapisti,* 1877, *MEW,* XIX, 107–112.
20 *MEW,* XXXV, 166–7.

21 *MEW,* XIX, 295–6; Andrzej Walicki, *The Controversy over Capitalism: Studies in the Social Philosophy of the Russian Populists* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 179–94; Neil A.Martin, "Marxism, nationalism and Russia", *JHI*, XXIX, No. 2 (May–June 1968), 246–52.
22 *Iskra,* No. 82 (1 January 1905), as cited in Isaac Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed: Trotsky, 1879–1921* (London, 1954), p. 104.
23 Leon Trotsky, *The Permanent Revolution* and *Results and Prospects,* (New York, 1970), p. 108.
24 *Ibid.,* pp. 100–15.
25 Erich E.Haberer, *Jews and Revolution in Nineteenth-Century Russia* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 94, 254 *et passim.* See also Robert J.Brym, *The Jewish Intelligentsia and Russian Marxism: A Sociological Study of Intellectual Radicalism and Ideological Divergence* (London, 1978); Leonard Schapiro, "The role of the Jews in the Russian Revolutionary Movement", *SEER,* XL, No. 94 (1961), 148–67; Jonathan Frankel, *Prophecy and Politics: Socialism, Nationalism and the Russian Jews, 1862–1917* (Cambridge, 1981).
26 Moshe Mishkinsky, "The Jewish Labor Movement and European Socialism", in *Jewish Society through the Ages,* ed. H.H.Ben-Sasson and S.Ettinger (London, 1971), p. 287.
27 Sergei N.Bulgakov, "An urgent task", in *A Revolution of the Spirit: Crisis of Value in Russia,* ed. Martha Bohachevsky-Choimiak and Bernice G.Rosenthal (Newtonville, Mass., 1982), p. 158.
28 Bulgakov, "Apokaliptika i sotsializm", reprinted in his *Dva grada. Issledovaniia o prirode obshchestvennykh idealov* (2 vols., M., 1911), II, 116. See also his *Karl Marks kak religioznyi tip* (M., 1911).
29 Christopher J.Read, *Religion, Revolution and the Russian Intelligentisa, 1900–1912: The* Vekhi *Debate and its Intellectual Background* (London, 1979), p. 80.
30 Anatoly V.Lunacharsky, *Religiia i soisializm* (2 vols.,SPb., 1908), I, 101.
31 Nikolai A.Berdiaev, "K istorii i psikhologii russkogo marksizma", *Poliarnaia zvezda,* 1906, No. 10, p. 684, as cited in Read, *Religion,* p. 71.
32 Nikolai A.Berdiaev, "Filosofskaia istina i intelligentskaia pravda", in *Vekhi. Sbornik statei o russkoi intelligentsii* (Frankfurt, 1967, a reprint of the 2nd edn., M., 1909), pp. 6, 13 (quotation).
33 Andrei Bely, "Rodine", *Stikhotvoreniia i poemy,* comp. T.Iu.Khmelnitskaia (M.-L., 1966), pp. 381–2.
34 Leon Trotsky, *Literature and Revolution* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1960), p. 125.
35 This is expanded in my "Ivanov-Razumnik and the Russian Revolution: From 'Scythianism' to Suffocation", *CSP,* XXI, No. 1 (March 1979), 15–27.
36 V.I.Lenin, "Sotsialisticheskoe otechestvo v opasnosti!", *PSS,* 5th edn. (55 vols., M., 1958–1965), XXXV, 357–8.
37 Mikhail S.Agursky, *Ideohgiia natsional-bol'shevizma* (Paris, 1980), pp. 50–6, 140–9; English expanded edn., *The Third Rome: National Bolshevism in the USSR* (Boulder, Colo., 1987); S.V.Utechin, *Russian Political Thought: A Concise History* (London, 1964), pp. 253–4, and Utechin, "Bolsheviks and their Allies after 1917: The Ideological Pattern", *SS,* X, No. 2 (October 1958), 131–3.
38 Nikolai V.Ustrialov, *V bor'be za Rossiiu* (Harbin, 1920), pp. 5, 13, as cited in Agursky, *Ideologiia,* pp. 64–5.
39 Agursky, *Ideologiia,* pp. 62–3.

40 Lenin, "Tezisy po voprosu o nemedlennom zakliuchenii separatnogo i anneksionistskogo mira" (7 January 1918), *PSS,* XXXV, 250.
41 Leon Trotsky, *The Draft Programme of the Communist International: A Criticism of Fundamentals* (London, 1954), p. 57.
42 Isaac Deutscher, *The Prophet Unarmed: Trotsky, 1921–1929* (London, 1959), p. 288.
43 Agursky, *Ideologiia,* pp. 238–46.
44 Agursky, *Ideologiia,* pp. 263–9, 238–46; Trotsky, *Draft Programme;* Trotsky, introduction to the 1930 German edition of *The Permanent Revolution,* in *The Permanent Revolution* and *Results and Prospects,* especially p. 149 (final quotations); William Korey, *The Soviet Cage: Anti-Semitism in Russia* (New York, 1973), pp. 65–6.
45 Nikolai A.Berdiaev, *Novoe srednevekov'e. Razmyshlenie o sud'be Rossii i Evropy* (Berlin, 1924), p. 38.
46 Berdiaev, *The Russian Idea* (New York, 1947), p. 8.
47 Paul Berline, "Russian religious philosophers and the Jews (Soloviev, Berdyaev, Bulgakov, Struve, Rozanov and Fedotov)", *Jewish Social Studies,* IX, No. 4 (October 1947), 291–2.
48 Nikolai A.Berdiaev, "The religion of Communism", in Carl Schmitt, Nikolai A. Berdiaev and Michael de la Bedoyàre, *Vital Realities* (New York, 1932), pp. 159–70.
49 Berdiaev, *Novoe srednevekov'e,* p. 87.
50 *Ibid.,* pp. 106–7, 118, 139–42 (final quotation, p. 142).
51 Berdiaev, *Russian Idea,* especially pp. 3, 7–9, 194–200, 119, 247–9.
52 For Soviet statements on nationality policy from Lenin to Gorbachev, see my "Ideology and the national question: Marxism-Leninism and the nationality policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union", in *Ideology and Soviet Politics,* ed. Stephen White and Alex Pravda (London, 1988), pp. 180–202.
53 D.L.Brandenberger and A.M.Dubrovsky, "'The people need a Tsar': The emergence of national Bolshevism as Stalinist ideology, 1931–1941", *EAS,* L, No. 5 July 1998), 873–92; Isabelle Kreindler, "The changing status of Russian in the Soviet Union", *IJSL,* No. 33 (1982), pp. 10–11.
54 George R.Urban, "Was Stalin (the Terrible) really a 'Great Man? A conversation with W.Averell Harriman (President Roosevelt's Special Ambassador to Churchill and Stalin, 1941–1946)", *Encounter,* LVII, No. 5 (November 1981), 25.
55 Isaac Deutscher, *Stalin: A Political Biography,* rev. edn. (Harmondsworth, Middx., 1966), p. 458; also E.A.Rees, "Stalin and Russian nationalism", in *Russian Nationalism,* ed. Hosking and Service, pp. 77–106.
56 *Vneshniaia politika Sovetskogo Soiuza* (M., 1947), III, 47, as cited in Frederick C. Barghoorn, *Soviet Russian Nationalism* (New York, 1956), p. 27.
57 Frederick C.Barghoorn, "Great Russian messianism in postwar soviet ideology", in *Continuity and Change in Russian and Soviet Thought,* ed. Ernest J.Simmons (Cambridge, Mass., 1955), pp. 540–1.
58 *Pravda,* 30 September 1946, as cited in Barghoorn, *Soviet,* p. 202.
59 Gleb P.Iakunin, "Moskovskaia Patriarkhiia i 'kul't lichnosti' Stalina", *RV,* No. 1 (1978), pp. 111–16, 130–5; Dimitry V.Pospielovsky, *The Russian Church under the Soviet Regime, 1917–1982* (2 vols., Crestwood, N.Y., 1984), I, 25–209; John S.Curtiss, "The Russian Orthodox Church during World War II", *American Review*

on the Soviet Union, VII, No. 4 (1946), 32–44. Felix Corley, *Religion in the Soviet Union: An Archival Reader* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 139–47, provides a vivid account of Stalin's meeting with the metropolitans.

This and some of the later sections on the Russian Orthodox Church draw freely from my "Orthodoxy and Russian Nationalism in the USSR, 1917–1988", in *Church, Nation and State in Russia and Ukraine,* ed. Geoffrey A.Hosking (Basingstoke, 1991), pp. 312–32. Again I am grateful to the School of Slavonic and East European Studies for permission to reproduce these paragraphs from this volume in the Macmillan/SSEES series.

60 Iakunin, "Moskovskaia", *RV,* No. 1 (1978), pp. 103–37 (quotation, p. 135), No. 2 (1978), pp. 110–50.

61 Metropolitan Nikolai of Krutitsy, *Konferentsiia vsekh Tserkvei i religioznykh ob"edinenii v SSSR* (M, 1952), p. 89, as cited in lakunin, "Moskovskaia", *RV,* No. 2, pp. 126–7.

62 Patriarch Aleksii, *Slova i rechi,* I, 206, as cited in lakunin, "Moskovskaia", *RV,* No. 2, p. 113.

63 lakunin, "Moskovskaia", *RV,* No. 2, p. 113.

64 Archpriest N.A.Khariuzov, "Moskva", *ZhMP,* 1947, No. 1, pp. 25–6.

65 Elie Karam, in Father Mikhail Zernov, "Mitropolit Livanskii Iliia i arkhimandrit Antiokhiiskogo patriarkhata Vasilii v gostiakh u patriarkha Moskovskogo i vseia Rusi Aleksiia", *ZhMP*, 1948, No. 1, p. 53.

66 Metropolitan Stefan of Sofia, "Rech' proiznesennaia Blazhenneishim Mitropolitom Sofiiskim Stefanom, Ekzarkhom Bolgarskim", *ZhMP,* 1948, No. 8, p. 16.

67 William C.Fletcher, *Religion and Soviet Foreign Policy, 1945–1970* (London, 1973); Pospielovsky, *Russian Church,* II, 309–17.

68 Andrzej Walicki argues that these features flowed necessarily from Marxism. Andrzej Walicki, *Marxism and the Leap to the Kingdom of Freedom: The Rise and Fall of the Communist Utopia* (Stanford, Cal., 1995).

5
De-Stalinization and the growth of Russian national consciousness

1 Vladimir A.Soloukhin, author's Foreword, *Honey on Bread: Short Stories* (M., 1982), p. 9.

2 *Ibid.,* pp. 7–9, and Deming Brown, *Soviet Russian Literature since Stalin* (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 237–43.

3 Leonid Plyushch, *History's Carnival: A Dissident's Autobiography* (London, 1979), p. 209.

4 Sergei Zalygin, "Na Irtyshe (Iz khroniki sela Krutye Luki)", *NM,* 1964, No. 2, pp. 3–80; N.N.Shneidman, *Soviet Literature in the 1970s: Artistic Diversity and Ideological Conformity* (Toronto, 1979), pp. 61–6; Dina R.Spechler, *Permitted Dissent in the USSR: Novy mir and the Soviet Regime* (New York, 1982), pp. 203–5.

5 Aleksandr I.Solzhenitsyn, "Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha. Povest'", *NM,* 1962, No. 11, pp. 8–74, and "Matrenin dvor", *NM,* 1963, No. 1, pp. 42–63.

6 Grigory Pomerants, "Son o spravedlivom vozmezdii (Moi zatianuvshiisia spor)", 3 March 1978, *Sintaksis,* No. 6 (1980), p. 86 (first published in *Poiski* [Moscow samizdat], No. 3).

7 Geoffrey Hosking, "The Russian peasant rediscovered: 'village prose' of the 1960s", *SR,* XXXII, No. 4 (December 1973), pp. 711–13, and Hosking, *Beyond Socialist Realism: Soviet Fiction since Ivan Denisovich* (London, 1980), pp. 40-9; Gleb Žekulin, "Aspects of peasant life as portrayed in contemporary Soviet literature", *CSS,* I, No. 4 (Winter 1967), pp. 61–2; Spechler, *Permitted Dissent,* pp. 184–6; Michael Scammell, *Sokhenitsyn: A Biography* (London, 1985), pp. 393–4, 425–6; Albert Todd, "The spiritual in recent Soviet literature", *Survey,* No. 66 (January 1968), pp. 103–4. On the publication of Ivan Denisovich, see Aleksandr I.Solzhenitsyn, *The Oak and the Calf: Sketches of Literary Life in the Soviet Union* (n.p., 1980); Vladimir la.Lakshin, *Solzhenitsyn, Tvardovsky and Novy Mir* (Cambridge, Mass., 1980); Tatiana A.Snigireva, *A.T. Tvardovskii. Poet i ego epokha* (Ekaterinburg, 1997), pp. 72–91.

8 Aleksandr I.Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago, 1918–1956: An Experiment in Literary Investigation,* 3 vols. (London, 1974–1978), II, 592–9.

9 Vera Alexandrova, *A History of Soviet Literature, 1917–1964* (Garden City, N.Y, 1964), p. 378; Spechler, *Permitted Dissent,* p. 92; Michael Glenny, "Introduction" to Lakshin, *Solzhenitsyn,* p. 22.

10 Vladimir N.Osipov, "Ploshchad' Maiakovskogo, stat'ia 70-aia", August 1970, *AS* 527, Grani, No. 80 (September 1971), pp. 110–35, and Osipov, "K chitateliam samizdata", 10 December 1971, *AS* 1171, *Grani,* No. 85 (October 1972), pp. 188–9; Mikhail Kheifets, "Russkii patriot Vladimir Osipov", *Kontinent,* No. 27 (1981), pp. 172–3. (*AS* refers to the Radio Liberty *Arkhiv samizdata* document number.)

11 "O krupnykh nedostatkakh v nauchnoi-ateisticheskoi propagande i merakh ee ulushcheniia", *Voprosy ideologicheskoi raboty* (M., 1961), pp. 61–5, cited in David E. Powell, *Antireligious Propaganda in the Soviet Union: A Study of Mass Persuasion* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978), p. 39. On the policy of Khrushchev and his successors to religion, see John Anderson, *Religion, State and Society in the Soviet Union and Successor States* (Cambridge, 1994).

12 "Ob oshibkakh v provedenii nauchno-ateisticheskoi propagandy sredi naseleniia", *Pravda,* 12 November 1954, cited in Powell, *Antireligious Propaganda in the Soviet Union,* p. 39.

13 Dimitry V.Pospielovsky, *The Russian Church under the Soviet Regime, 1917–1982* (2 vols., Crestwood, N.Y., 1984), I, 327–33; Bohdan R.Bociurkiw, "The shaping of Soviet religious policy", PC, XXII, No.3 (May–June 1973), pp. 48–9.

14 Anatoly E.Levitin-Krasnov, *V poiskakh Novogo grada. Vospominaniia,* Pt III (Tel-Aviv, 1980), p. 174.

15 Levitin-Krasnov's religious samizdat writings are collected in *Zashchita very v SSSR* (Paris, 1966), and *Dialog s Tserkovnoi Rossiei* (Paris, 1967). For Boris Talantov, see Michael Bourdeaux, *Patriarch and Prophets: Persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church Today* (London, 1969), pp. 125–54 (first published in *Vestnik,* No. 83 [1967], pp. 29–64), and *AS* 703, 745, 748. Nikolai I.Eshliman and Gleb P.Iakunin, letter to Patriarch Aleksii, M., 21 November 1965, in Bourdeaux, *Patriarch,* pp. 194–223.

16 Pospielovsky, *Russian Church,* I, 333–5; Bourdeaux, *Patriarch,* pp. 77–84, 112.

17 For an account of the Sobor, see *AS* 703, partly trans. in Michael Bourdeaux, "The Black Quinquennium: The Russian Orthodox Church, 1959–1964", *RCL,* IX, Nos. 1–2 (Spring 1981), 24–7; Pospielovsky, *Russian Church,* I, 335–58; Bourdeaux, *Patriarch,* pp. 24–33 *et passim*; Gerhard Simon, *Church, State and Opposition in the USSR* (London, 1974), pp. 69–72, 79–84.
18 For example, Vadim Shavrov, in Bourdeaux, *Patriarch,* p. 188.
19 For example, appeal from Feodosiia Varavva of Lvov and three other believers, 1 August 1964, in Bourdeaux, *Patriarch,* pp. 170–1.
20 Eshliman and Iakunin, in Bourdeaux, *Patriarch,* p. 200; Pospielovsky, *Russian Church,* I, 341–9; Simon, *Church,* pp. 72–9. For samizdat accounts of persecutions, see Bourdeaux, *Patriarch*; especially the complaint of the Spiritual Council of Pochaev Monastery to President N.V.Podgorny (1966), which appeared in the samizdat collection *Feniks-66* (Bourdeaux, *Patriarch,* pp. 98–115).
21 Bourdeaux, *Patriarch,* pp. 119, 122, 136, 176.
22 S.T.Palmer, "The restoration of ancient monuments in the USSR", *Survey,* Nos. 74–75 (Winter-Spring 1970), pp. 170–1.
23 Vladimir N.Osipov, "Russkii khudozhnik Ilia Glazunov", *Veche,* No. 8 (19 July 1973), *AS* 1665, pp. 171–72.
24 Bourdeaux, *Patriarch,* pp. 154–5; Scammell, *Solzhenitsyn,* pp. 380–1. Russian is *AS 721* (*SDS,* Vol. XI).
25 Scammell, *Sokhenitsyn,* pp. 477–8. Solzhenitsyn's story "Zakhar-Kalita" (Zakhar the Pouch) is based on this visit.
26 Pospielovsky, *Russian Church,* I, 358–9.

6
The Brezhnev era: cultural Russian nationalism

1 *V.I.Lenin, KPSS o sovetskom mnogonatsional'nom gosudarstve,* comp. E.V.Tadevosian (M., 1981), p. 165.
2 "Predmet bol'shogo patrioticheskogo vnimaniia", contributed by the journal *Chelovek i zakon* to *Kommunist,* 1978, No. 11 (July), p. 64. Short sections in this chapter and the following two previously appeared in "The Party and Russian nationalism", in *The Soviet Union: Party and Society,* ed. Peter J.Potichnyj, Selected Papers from the Third World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies, Washington, DC, 30 October-4 November 1985, (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 229–45. I am grateful to Cambridge University Press for permission to reproduce these sections.
3 Leonid Plyushch, *History's Carnival: A Dissident's Autobiography* (London, 1979), pp. 184–6 (quotation, p. 185).
4 Neil Hyams, "Russian nationalism", in *The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe: A Handbook,* ed. George Schöpflin, 2nd edn. (London, 1986), p. 238.
5 V.Kostin, "Passy vokrug kassy", *Izvestiia,* 11 December 1982.
6 Alexander Yanov, *The Russian New Right: Right- Wing Ideologies in the Contemporary USSR* (Berkeley, Cal., 1978), p. 13; Grigory Svirsky in *Le monde,* 8–9 September 1973, cited in Hyams, "Russian nationalism", p. 238.
7 Lev Z.Kopelev, "A lie is conquered only by truth", in *Samizdat Register I,* ed. Roy A. Medvedev (London, 1977), p. 227.

8 Vladimir A.Soloukhin, "Chernye doski. Zapiski nachinaiushchego kollektsionera", *Moskva,* 1969, No. 1, pp. 129–87.
9 John B.Dunlop, *The Faces of Contemporary Russian Nationalism* (Princeton, N.J., 1983), pp. 63–92; S.T.Palmer, "The restoration of ancient monuments in the USSR", *Survey,* Nos. 74–75 (Winter-Spring 1970), pp. 163–74; Robert C.Erasure, "Historic preservation policy in the USSR", CSP, XVI, No. 3 (Autumn 1974), 371–8; Dimitry V.Pospielovsky, "More on historic preservation policy in the USSR", *CSP,* XVII, No. 4 (Winter 1975), 641–9.
10 "Literaturnaia kritika rannykh slavianofilov", *VL,* 1969, No. 5, pp. 90–135, No. 7, pp. 116–52, No. 10, pp. 103–44, No. 12, pp. 73–140.
11 A.M.Ivanov, "Otrisatel'noe dostoinstvo", *VL,* 1969, No. 7, p. 131.
12 Ilia S.Glazunov, "Doroga k tebe. Iz zapisok khudozhnika", *MG,* 1966, No. 2, pp. 188, 190.
13 *PD,* No. 55 (April 1969), in *An End to Silence: Uncensored Opinion in the Soviet Union. From Roy Medvedev's Underground Magazine Political Diary,* ed. Stephen F.Cohen (New York, 1982), pp. 221–2.
14 See also Vladimir Seduro, *Dostoevski's Image in Russia Today* (Belmont, Mass., 1975).
15 Glazunov, "Doroga", *MG,* 1965, No. 10, pp. 91–142, No. 12, pp. 191–242, 1966, No. 2, pp. 171–92, 225–41, No. 6, pp. 236–71; Vladimir A.Soloukhin, "Pis'ma iz Russkogo Muzeia", *MG,* 1966, No. 9, pp. 236–78, No. 10, pp. 245–87.
16 "Pered ser'eznym razgovorom", *MG,* 1967, No. 6, p. 318.
17 Viktor A.Chalmaev, "Velikie iskaniia", *MG,* 1968, No. 3, pp. 270–95, and "Neizbezhnost"', *ibid.,* No. 9, pp. 259–89; Mikhail P.Lobanov, "Prosveshchennoe meshchanstvo", *ibid.,* No. 4, pp. 294–306. These articles are discussed in Yanov, *Russian,* pp. 39–48, and Dunlop, *Faces,* pp. 218–7. Excerpts from Chalmaev's articles are in *Faces,* pp. 312–22.
18 Chalmaev, "Velikie iskaniia", p. 289.
19 Chalmaev, "Neizbezhnost"', pp. 273, 282.
20 Chalmaev, "Velikie iskaniia", p. 285.
21 Lobanov, "Prosveshchennoe meshchanstvo", pp. 297–9, 304.
22 Anatoly P.Lanshchikov, "Ostorozhno—kontseptsiia! (Polemicheskie zametki)", *MG,* 1969, No. 2, pp. 275–97.
23 Feliks Chuev, in *MG,* 1968, No. 12, p. 212.
24 Sergei N.Semanov, "O tsennostiakh otnositel'nykh i vechnykh", *MG,* 1970, No. 8, pp. 308–20, especially p. 319 (quotation).
25 Semyon Reznik, "Kto takoi Sergei Semanov?", *Novaia gazeta* (New York), 11–17 December 1982, p. 10; Iuliia Vishnevskaia, "The arrest of Sergei Semanov", RL 416/82 (18 October 1982).
26 N.Mitkin, "V bor'be protiv trotskizma", *MG,* 1969, No. 10, pp. 289–96.
27 Vladimir Drobyshev, "Bessmerten, kak vremia", *MG,* No. 12, p. 278.
28 Dmitry Zhukov, "Sviaz' vremen", *MG,* No. 6, pp. 300–4.
29 Iury D.Ivanov, "Ekho russkogo naroda", *MG,* pp. 286–94.
30 Vadim V.Kozhinov, "Trizhdy velikaia", *MG,* No, 12, pp. 279–83 (quotations, pp. 281–2).
31 *PD,* No. 55 (April 1969), in *End to Silence, ed*. Cohen, pp. 219–21.
32 Vladimir Voronov, "Zaklinaniia dukhov", *Iunost',* 1968, No. 2, pp. 96–9.
33 "V otdele propagandy TsK KPSS", *Journalist,* 1969, No. 5, p. 78.

34 Aleksandr G.Dementev, "O traditsiiakh i narodnosti (Literaturnye zametki)", *NM,* 1969, No. 4, pp. 215–35 (quotation, p. 221).
35 "Protiv chego vystupaet *Novyi mir*?", *Ogonek,* 26 July 1969, pp. 26–9. Excerpts are in Dunlop, *Faces,* pp. 322–6.
36 Yanov, *Russian,* pp. 49–52.
37 Dina Spechler, *Permitted Dissent in the USSR: Novy mir and the Soviet Regime* (New York, 1982), pp. 195–230.
38 Aleksandr I.Soizhenitsyn, *The Oak and the Calf: Sketches of Literary Life in the Soviet Union* (n.p., 1980), pp. 244–52, 121–3.
39 Yanov, *Russian,* pp. 39–61; Dunlop, *Faces,* pp. 218–27, 312–26.
40 Raisa B.Lert, "The charms of the whip", *PD,* No. 75 (December 1970), in *End to Silence,* ed. Cohen, pp. 189–200.
41 *Veche,* No. 1 (January 1971), AS 1013, p. 140; Ianov, *Russian,* p. 53.
42 Roy A.Medvedev, *All Stalin's Men* (Oxford, 1983), p. 80. A transcript of this meeting is in *PD,* No. 75, reprinted in *Politicheskii dnevnik,* vol. II (Amsterdam, 1975).
43 Mikhail S.Agursky, "Politburo Axe Falls on Polyansky", *Jerusalem Post,* 14 March 1976; Yanov, *Russian,* pp. 55–60; Dunlop, *Faces,* pp. 43–4.
44 Georgy N.Vladimov, "Pisatel' i vlast'", talk given at GB-USSR Association, London, 2 December 1983; Michael Rywkin, *Moscow's Muslim Challenge: Soviet Central Asia* (London, 1982), p. 103; "Nemerknushchaia stranitsa istorii. Torzhestvennoe sobranie v chest' 600-letie Kulikovskoi bitvy", *Pravda,* 9 September 1980; O.Krasovsky, "Pole Kulikovo", *Veche* (Munich), No. 1 (1981), p. 64.
45 Roy A.Medvedev, *On Socialist Democracy* (London, 1975), p. 90.
46 V.Ivanov, "Sotsializm i kul'turnoe nasledstvo", *Kommunist,* 1970, No. 17 (November), p. 95.
47 *Ibid.,* p. 100.
48 Aleksandr N.Iakovlev, "Protiv antiistorizma", *LG,* 15 November 1972.
49 Yanov, *Russian,* pp. 57–9; Dunlop, *Faces,* pp. 227–9. For a view from the inside of *Molodaia gvardiia,* which could only be published in the era of Gorbachev's *glasnost',* see Mikhail P.Lobanov, "Posleslovie. Iz vospominanii", NS, 1988, No. 4, pp. 154–9.
50 V.I.Protchenko, "Sovremennaia 'derevenskaia proza' v literaturnoi kritike. (Real'nye dostizheniia i spornye otsenki)", *Russkaia literatura,* 1977, No. 2, pp. 54–5.

My discussion of Soviet literature under Brezhnev draws from Geoffrey A. Hosking, *Beyond Socialist Realism: Soviet Fiction since Ivan Denisovich* (London, 1980), chs. iii, v, vii; N.N.Shneidman, *Soviet Literature in the 1970s: Artistic Diversity and Ideological Conformity* (Toronto, 1979), chs. iv, v; Deming Brown, *Soviet Russian literature since Stalin* (Cambridge, 1978), chs. viii, ix, xi; Mikhail S.Agursky, "The New Russian Literature" (Jerusalem, 1980), and "Contemporary Russian nationalism—history revised" (Jerusalem, 1982); Philippa Lewis, "Peasant nostalgia in contemporary Russian literature", *SS,* XXVIII, No. 4 (October 1976), 548–69.

51 Geoffrey A.Hosking, "Vasilii Belov—chronicler of the Soviet village", *RR,* XXXIV, No. 2 (April 1975), 165–85, and Hosking, *Beyond,* pp. 57–70.
52 Vasily I.Belov, *Kanuny* (M., 1976).

53 Four of his stories are in Valentin G.Rasputin, *Chetyre povesti. Proshchanie s Materoi. Zhivi i pomni. Poslednii srok. Den'gi dlia Marii* (L., 1982).
54 David C.Gillespie, *Valentin Rasputin and Soviet Russian Village Prose* (London, 1986), p. 56.
55 *Ibid.,* p. 59.
56 A similar point is made by Robert Porter, "The Mother theme in Valentin Rasputin", *CSP,* XXVIII, No. 3 (September 1986), p. 293. On Rasputin, see also Hosking, *Beyond,* pp. 70–81; Robert Porter, *Four Contemporary Russian Writers* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 11–51; Teresa Polowy, *The Novellas of Valentin Rasputin: Genre, Language and Style* (New York, 1989); Deming Brown, "Valentin Rasputin: a general view", in *Russian Literature and Criticism: Selected Papers from the Second World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies,* ed. Evelyn Bristol (Berkeley, Cal., 1982), pp. 27–35; also pp. 63–68, John B. Dunlop, "Valentin Rasputin's Proshchanie s Materoi"; Shneidman, *Soviet Literature,* ch. v.
57 Dunlop, *Faces,* p. 121.
58 Valentin G.Rasputin, "Deiateli sovetskoi kul'tury o Dostoevskom: V.G.Rasputin", in *Dostoevskii. Materialy i issledovaniia,* ed. G.M.Fridlender, V (L., 1983), 66–7.
59 Vasily I.Belov, "Lad. Ocherki o narodnoi estetike", AS, 1979, No. 10, pp. 117–58, No. 12, pp. 85–96, 1980, No. 3, pp. 60–84, 1981, No. 1, pp. 160–74, No. 5, pp. 145–71, No. 6, pp. 143–53, No. 7, pp. 125–64. Also published by Molodaia gvardiia (under the same title) as a lavishly illustrated photo album (M., 1982).
60 Pyotr L.Proskurin, "Imia tvoe", *Roman-gazeta,* 1978, No. 14, p. 34, cited in Mikhail S. Agursky, "The attitude to religion in the new Russian literature", *RCL,* X, No. 2 (Autumn 1982), 148.
61 Agursky, "Attitude", pp. 145–55; Valentin Sorokin, "Dmitrii Donskoi", *NS,* 1977, No. 12, pp. 119–34.
62 A Soviet study which sought to counter this trend was Valery A.Kuvakin, *Religioznaia Filosofiia v Rossii nachalo XX veka* (M., 1980).
63 Sergei V.Vikulov, "O derevne i 'derevenshchikakh'", *MG,* 1971, No. 6, pp. 276–7.
64 For differing interpretations, see Dunlop, *Faces,* pp. 121–9; Dmitry V.Pospielovsky, "The neo-Slavophile trend and its relation to the contemporary religious revival in the USSR", in *Religion and Nationalism in Soviet and East European Politics,* ed. Pedro Ramet (Durham, N.C., 1984), pp. 49–50; O.Galin, "Misteriia XX veka", *Posev,* 1977, No. 8, pp. 54–7; Igor N.Golomshtok, "Fenomen Glazunova", *Sintaksis,* No. 4 (1979), pp. 119–38.
65 Dmitry Zhukov, "Vekhi puti", *Pravda,* 15 June 1978.
66 Oleg V.Volkov, "Ia uvidel Rossiiu", *NS,* 1979, No. 3, pp. 174–83.
67 *V svete preobrazheniia,* 1979, No. 6 (11 February), appendix, in *VS,* No. 33 (1979), p. 94.
68 Olga Carlisle, "L'audience de Soljenitsyne en occident et en URSS", *Le monde diplomatique,* September 1978, p. 2. This view is rejected in *Russkaia ideia ili KGB? Kto—Glazunov*? ([Paris, ?1977]), which sees Glazunov as part of the Russian renaissance.
69 Sergei Iurenen, "Il'ya Glazunov Appointed Director of New Soviet Museum: A Victory for the 'Russian Group?" RL 139/85 (29 April 1985), pp. 2–4; Medvedev, *All Stalin's Men,* p. 80. Many of Glazunov's paintings and drawings are in *Il'ia Glazunov,* a photo album (M., 1978).

70 Leonid I.Borodin, "Po povodu vystavki I.Glazunova", M., July 1978, *RV,* No. 5 (1979), p. 74. Glazunov's relations with the nationalist dissidents and the views and activities of Dudko and Borodin are discussed in the next chapter.
71 *A Chronicle of Current Events (CCE), No. 41,* (3 August 1976), p. 177.
72 Sergei N.Semanov, *Serdtse rodiny* (M., 1977), *Brusilov* (M., 1980); see Reznik, and Vishnevskaia, both cited in n. 25 (this chapter).
73 "Predmet" (see n. 2 (this chapter) above), pp. 53–66.
74 Viktor A.Chalmaev, "Otbleski plameni. Voenno-patrioticheskaia tema: traditsii, dostizheniia, poiski", *Moskva,* 1978, No. 2, p. 187.
75 "Klassika i my", *Poiski* (France), No. 2 (1980), p. 75.
76 *Ibid.,* pp. 65–88, and Raisa B.Lert, "Vyskazannoe i nedoskazannye", August 1978, *ibid.,* pp. 89–113.
77 See Mikhail Kheifets, "Anti-Semitism of the 'Adherents of State Nationalism'. (Based on books published in the Series ZH.Z.L. in the Late 1970s and Early 1980s)", in *Jews and Jewish Topics in Soviet and East-European Publications* (Jerusalem), September 1985, pp. 4–14; Agursky, "Contemporary Russian nationalism—history revised", especially pp. 32–56; John A.Armstrong, "Soviet nationalities policies", in "Proceedings of the Experts' Conference on Soviet Jewry, London, 4–6 January 1983", *SJA,* XV, No. 1 (February 1985), 65–8.
78 Valentin S. Pikul, "U poslednei cherty", *NS,* 1979, No. 4, pp. 19–152, No. 5, pp. 62–145, No. 6, pp. 79–120, No. 7, pp. 34–127.
79 "O podgotovke k 600-letiiu Kulikovskoi bitvy", *Izvestiia,* 28 October 1979.
80 Dmitry S.Likhachev, "Sebe i potomkam", *Pravda,* 10 November 1979.
81 Likhachev, "Zametki o russkom", *NM,* 1980, No. 3, pp. 10–38.
82 *Ibid.,* p. 38.
83 *Ibid.,* p. 32.
84 Likhachev, *Zametki o russkom,* 2nd edn. (M., 1984), included in Dmitry S.Likhachev, *Reflections on Russia* (Boulder, Colo., 1991).
85 *Arkhitekturno-khudozhestvennye pamiatniki Solovetskikh ostrovov,* ed. Dmitry S.Likhachev (M., 1980).
86 Valentin G.Rasputin, "Za Nepriadvoi lebedi krichali. K 600-letiiu bitvy na pole Kulikovom", *SK,* 4 January 1980; Vladimir Solovyov and Elena Klepikova, "Inside the Kremlin", *PR,* XLVIII, No. 2 (1981), 215.
87 Anatoly N.Kirpichnikov, *Kulikovskaia bitva* (L., 1980), p. 3.
88 Iury I.Seleznyov, "'Chtoby starye rasskazyvali, a molodye pomnili!' Istoricheskie korni traditsii russkoi voinskoi poezii", *NS,* 1980, No. 3, pp. 176–84 (quotations, pp. 179–80).
89 Iury M.Loshchits, *Dmitrii Donskoi* (M., 1980), pp. 309–10 (quotations, p. 310).
90 V.Smirnov and A.Volgin, "Prepodobnyi Andrei Rublev, ikonopisets", *ZhMP,* 1980, No. 7, pp. 69–79.
91 "K 600-letiiu pobedy na Kulikovom pole", *ZhMP,* 1980, No. 9, p. 68.
92 "Slovo Sviateishego Patriarkha Pimena", in "K 600-letiiu pobedy na Kulikovom pole", *ZhMP,* 1980, No. 12, p. 6.
93 Feliks Kuznetsov, "Pole russkoi slavy", *LG,* 10 January 1980.
94 Vladimir Kuprin, "Ot sostavitelia", in *Mezh Nepriadvoi i Donom. (K 600-letiiu Kulikovskoi bitvy),* comp. Vladimir Kuprin (M., 1980), p. 3.
95 "Vsegda aktual'naia tema", *Kommunist,* 1981, No. 8 (May), pp. 38–48.

7
The Brezhnev era: dissident Russian messianism

1 John B.Dunlop, *The New Russian Revolutionaries* (Belmont, Mass., 1976); also Alexander Yanov, *The Russian New Right: Right-Wing Ideologies in the Contemporary USSR* (Berkeley, Cal., 1978), ch. ii. Conversations with former VSKhSON members in prison camps are described in Aleksandr A.Petrov-Agatov, "Arestantskie vstrechi", *Grani,* No. 82 (December 1971), pp. 99–126, No. 83 (May 1972), pp. 47–78, and No. 84 (July 1972), pp. 56–96
2 Dunlop, *New Russian Revolutionaries,* pp. 13–14, 19–45.
3 Evgeny A.Vagin, "Interv'iu *Vestniku RKhD*" August 1977, *Vestnik,* No. 122 (1977), pp. 254–5.
4 Dunlop, *New Russian Revolutionaries,* pp. 81–2.
5 *Ibid.,* p. 290.
6 The Programme is translated in Dunlop, *ibid.,* pp. 243–93; original in *Vserossiiskii Sotsial-Khristianskii Soiuz Osvobozhdeniia Naroda. Programma, sud, v t'iurmakh i lageriakh,* ed. John B.Dunlop (Paris, 1975), and "VSKhSON. Materialy suda i programma", *VS,* No. 22 (1976).
7 Anatoly E.Levitin-Krasnov, *Rodnoi prostor. Demokraticheskoe dvizhenie. Vospominaniia,* Pt IV (Frankfurt, 1981), pp. 176–7.
8 Evgeny A.Vagin, "*Rodnoi prostor* A.Levitina-Krasnova", *Veche* (Munich), No. 6 (1982), pp.173–9.
9 Dunlop, *New Russian Revolutionaries,* pp. 213–14.
10 *Ibid.,* pp. 246–7 (quotation, p. 247).
11 Vladimir N.Osipov, "Berdiaevskii kruzhok v Leningrade", January 1972, P*osev, 1*972, No. 11, pp. 3–10. Ianov attacks Dunlop for neglecting the influence of Mussolini on Berdiaev, and through him on the ideas of VSKhSON. (Yanov, *Russian,* pp. 28–30.) As Darrell Hammer suggests, Ianov is distorting Berdiaev's attitude towards fascism. (Darrell P.Hammer, "Russian Nationalism and the 'Yanov Thesis'", *RCL,* X, No. 3 (Winter 1982), p. 314.)
12 Vagin, "Interv'iu", p. 256; and Vagin, "Religioznoe inakomyslie v segodniashnei Rossii", *RV,* No. 1 (1978), p. 57.
13 Iury T.Galanskov, letter to his mother, 29 March 1969, in "Iu.T.Galanskov. Poet i chelovek", samizdat, *Grani,* Nos. 89–90 (1973), p. 192.
14 Vladimir N.Osipov, "Otkrytoe pis'mo Gennadiiu Shimanovu", 29 April 1973, *AS* 1732, in *VS,* Nos. 17–18 (1975), p. 16.
15 See, for example, Vagin, "Interv'iu", p. 252; Vagin, "Litsom k Rossii", *Posev,* 1976, No. 10, pp. 52–9; "Evgenii Aleksandrovich Vagin", *RM,* 15 September 1977; and "K budushchei svobodnoi Rossii", *RM,* 18 January 1979.
16 Andrei A.Amalrik, *Notes of a Revolutionary* (New York, 1982), p. 44.
17 Dunlop, *New Russian Revolutionaries,* p. 293.
18 Natalia Aleksandrova, "V dni podpol'ia i zakliucheniia. Zapad k nam nikakogo uchastiia ne proiavil, vspominaet Leonid Borodin", *NG,* 16 July 1999. See also "Leningradskie protsessy", *Posev,* 1968, No. 1, pp. 9–11; "Vserossiiskii sotsialkhristianskii soiuz osvobozhdeniia naroda: sostav, programma, melody raboty, ideologicheskie pozitsii, prichiny porazheniia", 1969, *AS* 525 (*SDS* VII), *Posev,* 1971, No. 1, pp. 38–43.

19 Anatoly E.Levitin-Krasnov, *V poiskakh novogo grada. Vospominaniia,* Pt III (Tel-Aviv, 1980), p. 252.
20 For documents on these cases, see Michael Bourdeaux, *Patriarch and Prophets: Persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church Today* (London, 1969), pp. 189–254. On the situation of the Russian Orthodox Church under Brezhnev, see *ibid., RCL* and *Vestnik, passim*.
21 Levitin-Krasnov, *V poiskakh,* p. 256.
22 On the human rights movement, see Peter Reddaway, "The development of dissent and opposition", in *The Soviet Union since the Fall of Khrushchev,* ed. Archie Brown and Michael Kaser (London, 1982), pp. 121–56; Reddaway, "Policy towards dissent since Khrushchev", in *Authority, Power and Policy in the USSR: Essays Dedicated to Leonard Schapiro,* ed. T.Harry Rigby, Archie Brown and Peter Reddaway (London, 1980), pp. 158–92; and Reddaway, "Dissent in the Soviet Union", *PC,* XXXII, No. 6 (November–December 1983), 1–15; Andrei Amalrik, *Prosushchestvuet li Sovetskii 1984g.?* (Amsterdam, 1970); and Amalrik, "Ideologies in Soviet Society", *Survey,* XXII, No. 2 (Spring 1976), pp. 1–11; *Dissent in the USSR: Politics, Ideology and People,* ed. Rudolf L.Tokés (Baltimore, Md., 1975); *Samizdat and Political Dissent in the Soviet Union,* ed. F.J.M.Feldbrugge (Leyden, 1975).
23 Bourdeaux, *Patriarch,* pp. 212–13.
24 *Ibid.,* p. 213.
25 *Ibid.,* pp. 214–19.
26 Levitin-Krasnov, "The Lord is my safe stronghold", in Bourdeaux, *Patriarch,* p. 263.
27 On Levitin-Krasnov, see *ibid.,* pp. 255–303; J.A.Broun, "Russia's Don Quixote", *New Blackfriars,* LV, No.,649 (June 1974), 272–9.
28 Anatoly E.Levitin-Krasnov, *Stromaty* (Frankfurt, 1972), p. 124.
29 Levitin-Krasnov, *Rodnoi prostor,* p. 75 onwards.
30 *Ibid.,* pp. 488–91.
31 *CCE,* No. 7 (30 April 1969), in *Uncensored Russia: The Human Rights Movement in the Soviet Union. The Annotated Text of the Unofficial Moscow Journal "A Chronicle of Current Events" (Nos. 1–11),* ed. and trans. Peter Reddaway (London, 1972), pp. 431–2; Levitin-Krasnov, *Rodnoi prostor,* pp. 178–9.
32 N.N., "Metanoia", introduction, *AS* 896, in *Vestnik,* No. 97 (1970), pp. 4–7.
33 O.Altaev (pseud.), "Dvoinoe soznanie intelligentsii i psevdokul'tura", 1969, *AS* 897, in *Vestnik,* No. 97, (1970) pp. 8–32 (quotation p. 32).
34 V.Gorsky (pseud.), "Russkii messianizm i novoe natsional'noe soznanie", 1969, *AS* 899 *(SDS XXVI),* in *Vestnik,* No. 97 (1970), pp. 33–68 (quotation, p. 35).
35 *Ibid.,* p. 49.
36 *Ibid.,* p. 51.
37 *Ibid.,* pp. 61, 63.
38 *Ibid.,* pp. 67–8.
39 Leonid I.Borodin, "Vestnik RSKhD i russkaia intelligentsiia", *Veche,* No. 8 (19 July 1973), *AS* 1665, pp. 131–60 (also in Grani, No. 96 (April–June 1975), pp. 232–64; excerpts trans. in John B.Dunlop, *The Faces of Contemporary Russian Nationalism* (Princeton, N.J., 1983), pp. 345–53).
40 Gennady M.Shimanov, "Tri otkrytykh pis'ma N.A.Struve, redaktoru zhurnala 'Vestnik RSKhd'", first letter, dated 1 February 1972, in his "Protiv techeniia", M.,

1 February 1975, *AS* 2086, pp. 2–9. Also at *AS* 1132 (*SDS XXII, MS* 30/72). See also L.Ibragimov, "Po povodu sbornika stat'ei posviashchennykh sud'bam Rossii, opublikovannogo v No. 97 zhurnala Vestnik Russkogo Studencheskogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia", *Vestnik,* No. 106 (1972), pp. 309–14; and Vladimir N.Osipov, "Pis'mo v redaktsiiu zhurnala 'Vestnik RSKhD'", Rozhdestveno, 26 November 1972, *ibid.,* p. 295.

41 K.Radugin, "Budi sie, budi", 1970–1972, *AS* 1360 *(SDS XXVI)* in *Vestnik,* No. 106 (1972), pp. 315–19 (quotations, pp. 316, 318).

42 *Ibid.,* pp. 318–19.

43 Russkie patrioty, "Slovo natsii", *AS* 590, in *Veche* (Munich), No. 3 (1981), pp. 106–31. Excerpts are translated under the misleading title "A Word to the Nation", *Survey,* XVII, No. 3 (Summer 1971), 191–9.

44 "Slovo natsii", *ibid.,* p. 124.

45 *Ibid.,* p. 130.

46 *Ibid.,* p. 129

47 *Ibid.,* p. 131.

48 O.M., "*Survey* o russkom natsionalizme", *Veche,* No. 9 (19 December 1973), *AS* 2040, in *VS,* Nos. 17–18 (1975), p. 159.

49 Demokraty Rossii, Ukrainy i Pribaltiki, *Programma Demokraticheskogo dvizheniia Sovetskogo Soiuza,* October 1969, *AS* 340 (Amsterdam, 1970), pp. 54–55. (Also in *SDS,* Vol. V)

50 O.M., "Survey", p. 159.

51 Levitin-Krasnov, *Rodnoi prostor,* p. 238.

52 Iuliia Vishnevskaia, "Neo-Nazis in the Soviet Union", RL 226/85 (11 July 1985), p. 8.

53 *CCE,* No. 63 (31 December 1981), pp. 47–8.

54 *CCE,* No. 17 (31 December 1970), p. 93.

55 *Veche,* No. 1 (January 1971), *AS* 1013; No. 2 (19 May 1971), *AS* 1020; No. 3 (19 September 1971), *AS* 1108; No. 4 (31 January 1972), A*S* 1140; No. 5 (25 May 1972), *AS* 1230; No. 6 (19 October 1972), *AS* 1599; No. 7 (19 February 1973), *AS* 1775; No. 8 (19 July 1973), *AS* 1665; No. 9 (19 December 1973), *AS* 2040; (Nos. 1–9 are all in *SDS,* Vol. XXI;) No. 10 (19 April 1974), *AS* 2452.

Some of the material in this section appeared in my article, "The fate of Russian nationalism: The Samizdat journal *Veche* revisited", *RCL,* XVI, No. 1 (Spring 1988), 36–53, which contains further discussion. *Religion in Communist Lands,* now *Religion, State and Society,* was published by Keston College, now Keston Institute, Oxford. I am grateful to Keston Institute for permission to reproduce this material.

56 Levitin-Krasnov, *Rodnoi prostor,* pp. 235–7.

57 Vladimir N.Osipov, "Tri otnosheniia k rodine", 25 March—2 April 1970, *AS* 1147, in his *Tri otnosheniia k rodine. Stat'i, ocherki, vystupleniia* (Frankfurt, 1978), pp. 25–34.

58 *Ibid.,* pp. 32–4.

59 Mikhail Kheifets, "Russkii patriot Vladimir Osipov", *Kontinent,* No. 28 (1981), p. 141.

60 *Ibid*., pp. 140–1, 146–7.

61 Osipov, "Russkii khudozhnik Il'ia Glazunov", *Veche,* No. 8, pp. 160–77.

62 Yanov, *Russian,* p. 64.

63 Kheifets, "Russkii patriot", *Kontinent,* No. 28, p. 155.
64 Osipov, *Tri otnosheniia,* pp. 211–18.
65 Ivanov-Skuratov (under pseud. A.Skuratov), "U istokov russkogo samosoznaniia", *Veche,* No. 1, pp. 4–12. (English in *The Political, Social and Religious Thought of Russian "Samizdat"—An Anthology*, ed. Mikhail Meerson-Aksenov and Boris I.Shragin (Belmont, Mass., 1977), pp. 404–13.)
66 Mikhail Kheifets, "Russkii patriot Vladimir Osipov", *Kontinent,* No. 27 (1981), pp. 190–1, 162.
67 Levitin-Krasnov, *Rodnoi prostor,* p. 237.
68 Semyon Reznik, "Kto takoi Sergei Semanov?", *Novaia gazeta* (New York), 11–17 December 1982.
69 Kheifets, "Russkii patriot", *Kontinent,* No. 27, pp. 203–14.
70 For discussions of the content of *Veche,* see Yanov, *Russian,* pp. 62–84; Dimitry V. Pospielovsky, "The resurgence of Russian nationalism in *Samizdat*", *Survey,* XIX, No. 1 (Winter 1973), pp. 64–74; Pospielovsky, "The Samizdat Journal 'Veche': Russian Patriotic Thought Today", Radio Liberty CRD 331/71 (5 November 1971), pp. 11–25; Philip Walters, "A new creed for Russians? The ideas of the neo-Slavophils", *RCL,* IV No. 3 (Autumn 1976), 20–31; Dunlop, *Faces, passim;* see also Darrell P. Hammer, "Vladimir Osipov and the Veche Group (1971–1974): a page from the history of political dissent", *RR,* XLIII, No. 4 (October 1984), 355–75.
71 "Na veche!", *Veche,* No. 1, pp. 2–3.
72 Ivanov-Skuratov, "U istokov".
73 Mikhail F.Antonov, "Uchenie slavianofilov—vysshii vzlet narodnogo samosoznaniia v Rossii v doleninskii period", *Veche,* No. 1, pp. 13–44, No. 2, pp. 4–27, No. 3, pp. 5–49.
74 *Veche,* No. 1, pp. 14–17.
75 *Ibid.,* pp. 19–44 (quotation, p. 43).
76 A.S., "Mnenie opponenta", *ibid,* pp. 45–47 (quotation, p. 45).
77 *Veche,* No. 1, p. 47.
78 "Poiasnenie zhurnala *Veche* po povodu raboty M.F.Antonova", *Veche,* No. 2, p. 3.
79 Antonov, "Uchenie", *ibid.,* p. 21.
80 A.S., "Mnenie", p. 46.
81 Antonov, "Uchenie", *Veche,* No. 3, pp. 5–39 (quotations, pp. 37, 38).
82 *Ibid.,* pp. 39, 44–45.
83 "General M.D.Skobelev kak polkovodets i gosudarstvennyi deiatel'", *Veche,* No. 2, pp. 48–66, No. 3, pp. 75–92, No. 4, pp. 45–68. The attribution to Ivanov-Skuratov is in Mario Corti, "Repressive Measures against two Russian Nationalists", RL 265/82 (30 June 1982), p. 3.
84 "Mysli-prozhektory", *Veche,* No. 2, pp. 28–32.
85 I.Starozhubaev, "Neskol'ko slov po povodu", *Veche,* No. 7, pp. 78–82 (quotation, p. 78). The Radio Liberty *Arkhiv Samizdata* copy is illegible in places.
86 "Pisatel' Solzhenitsyn i professor Serebriakov", *Veche,* No. 4, pp. 145–50; "Avgust 14-go chitaiut na rodine", *Veche,* No. 8, pp. 200–6.
87 "Obsuzhdenie *romana Avgust 14-go*", *Veche,* No. 5, in *VS,* Nos. 9–10, pp. 175–83.
88 Reshetovskaia's chapters were excluded from the *VS* edition of *Veche,* No. 5, following legal representations on behalf of Solzhenitsyn. His own chapters are in *Veche,* No. 9, pp. 67–99.

89 Kheifets, "Russkii patriot", *Continent,* No. 28, pp. 158–65.
90 "Russkoe reshenie natsional'nogo voprosa (k 50-letiiu SSSR)", *Veche,* No. 6, pp. 6–10 (quotations, pp. 6–8).
91 "Bor'ba s tak nazyvaemym rusofil'stvom, ili put' gosudarstvennogo samoubiisrva", *Veche,* No. 7, in *VS,* Nos. 17–18, pp. 19–57. Extracts are trans. in Dunlop, *Faces,* pp. 327–44.
92 "Beseda redaktora zhurnala *Veche* V.N.Osipova s korrespondentom Assoshieited Press Stivinzom Broningom i s korrespondentom gazety *Baltimor son* Dinom Milzom", 25 April 1972, *AS* 1468, *Vestnik,* No. 106 (1972), pp. 296–303 (quotations, pp. 299, 302). (English in Dunlop, *Faces,* pp. 301–8.)
93 See Osipov, "Pis'mo v redaktsiiu" (see n. 40 this chapter).
94 Vladimir N.Osipov, "Ekstrennoe zaiavlenie dlia pechati", 7 March 1974, *AS* 1705 (*MS* 23/74).
95 *Veche,* No. 10 (19 April 1974), *AS* 2452, pp. 1–3, excerpts trans. in Dunlop, *Faces,* pp. 298–300.
96 Adel Naidenovich and ten other friends and supporters of *Veche,* "Po povodu vystupleniia V Osipova protiv zhurnala *Veche* (Zaiavlenie sotrudnikov zhurnala *Veche* i lichnykh znakomykh V Osipova)", 17 April 1974, AS 1787 (*MS* 32/74).
97 *Veche,* No. 10, *AS* 2452; Kheifets, "Russkii patriot", *Kontinent,* No. 28, pp. 173–4. Sec also "O vykhode 10 nomera zhurnala *Veche*", 20 April 1974, *AS* 1706 (*MS* 23/74); Vladislav V Iliakov and six other former political prisoners who had known Vladimir Osipov, "Zaiavlenie po povodu vykhoda tak nazyvaemogo 10-go nomera *VECHE*', 25 May 1974, *AS* 1790 (*MS* 32/74); *Veche* editorial board, "Ot redaktsii zhurnala *Veche*", 12 June 1974, AS 1791 (*MS* 32/74).
98 *Veche* editorial board, "Soobshchenie redaktsii zhurnala *Veche",* 9 July 1974, *AS 17*92 (*MS* 32/74); *CCE,* No. 32 (17 July 1974), pp. 68–9; Vladimir N.Osipov, letter to Minister of Internal Affairs N.A.Shcholokov, 25 May 1974, *AS* 1845 (*MS* 7/75).
99 *Zemlia,* No. 1 (1 August 1974), *AS* 1909 *(MS* 13/75); No. 2 (25 November 1974), *AS* 2060 (*MS* 25/75). Substantial extracts are in "Iz zhurnala *Zemlia* NoNo 1 i 2", *VS,* No. 20 (1975).
100 Vladimir N.Osipov and Viacheslav S.Rodionov, "K zemle", *Zemlia,* No. 1, in *VS,* No. 20, pp. 30–1 (quotation, p. 30).
101 Viacheslav S.Rodionov, "Zaiavlenie", 15 December 1974, AS 2061 (*MS 1*0/75).
102 *CCE,* No. 34 (31 December 1974), pp. 28–9; No. 35 (31 March 1975), p. 135; No. 37 (30 September 1975), pp. 5–8; No. 38 (31 December 1975), pp. 97–8; Kheifets, "Russkii patriot", *Kontinent,* No. 28, pp. 174–7; "Vladimir Osipov osuzhden na 8 let!", *Vestnik,* No. 116 (1975), p. 257; "Novyi prigovor Vladimiru Osipovu", *Posev,* 1975, No. 10, p. 12.
103 Mikhail S.Agursky, "The intensification of neo-Nazi dangers in the Soviet Union", [mid-1974], in *Political, Social,* ed. Meerson-Aksenov and Shragin, pp. 416–17. *AS* 1858; Russian in NZh, No. 118 (March 1975), pp. 199–227.
104 Yanov, *Russian,* p. 62.
105 Aleksandr I.Solzhenitsyn, *Letter to the Soviet Leaders* (London, 1974); Solzhenitsyn *et al., From under the Rubble* ([Glasgow], 1974).
106 *Moskovskii sbornik,* No. 1 (September 1974), ,4s 2050. Leonid I.Borodin, "Mersi, ili volosy dybom", *ibid.,* pp. 191–7.
107 *Moskovskii sbornik,* No. 2 (January 1975), summarized in *CCE,* No. 35 (31 March 1975), p. 148.

108 Evgeny A.Vagin, "Religioznoe inakomyslie v segodniashnei Rossii'", Rome, 1977, in RV, No. 1(1978), p. 64.
109 For listings of some of the principal works by and about Solzhenitsyn, see Michael Scammell, *Solzhenitsyn: A Biography* (London, 1985), pp. 1019–22; Stephen Carter, *The Politics of Sokhenitsyn* (London, 1977), pp. 153–5; Edward E.Ericson, Jr., *Solzhenitsyn and the Modern World* (Washington, B.C., 1993), pp. 407–21.
110 *The Solzhenitsyn Files: Secret Soviet Documents Reveal One Man's Fight against the Monolith,* ed. Michael Scammell (Chicago, 1995), pp. 283–92.
111 See n. 105 (this chapter).
112 Igor R.Shafarevich, "Separation or reconciliation? The nationalities question in the USSR", in Solzhenitsyn *et al., From Under the Rubble,* p. 100.
113 *Ibid.,* pp. 88–104 (quotation, p. 99).
114 Aleksandr I.Solzhenitsyn, "Repentance and self-limitation in the life of nations", in *From Under the Rubble,* p. 135.
115 Solzhenitsyn, *Gulag,* III, 46.
116 Solzhenitsyn, *Letter, passim.*
117 Solzhenitsyn, foreword to Igor R.Shafarevich, *The Socialist Phenomenon* (New York, 1980), pp. vii–ix.
118 Solzhenitsyn, "Repentance", pp. 105–43, and Solzhenitsyn, *Letter.*
119 Solzhenitsyn, "Repentance", p. 115.
120 Solzhenitsyn, p. 116.
121 Vadim Borisov, "Personality and national awareness", in Solzhenitsyn *et al., From Under the Rubble,* p. 213.
122 F.Korsakov, "Russian destinies", in Solzhenitsyn *et al., From Under the Rubble,* p. 165.
123 Solzhenitsyn, "Repentance", pp. 119–20.
124 Shafarevich, "Separation", p. 101.
125 Borisov, "Personality and national awareness", in Solzhenitsyn *et al., From Under the Rubble,* p. 213.
126 Solzhenitsyn, "Repentance", p. 122.
127 *Ibid.,* pp. 121–8.
128 Aleksandr I.Solzhenitsyn, "The Smatterers", in Solzhenitsyn *et al., From Under the Rubble,* pp. 229–78.
129 Borisov, "Personality", p. 197.
130 Solzhenitsyn, "Smatterers", p. 274.
131 *Ibid.,* pp. 229–78.
132 Solzhenitsyn, "Repentance", p. 142.
133 Igor R.Shafarevich, "Does Russia Have a Future?" in Solzhenitsyn *et al., From Under the Rubble,* pp. 292–4.
134 Evgeny Barabanov, "The Schism between the Church and the world", in Solzhenitsyn *et al., From Under the Rubble,* pp. 172–93 (quotations, pp. 188, 192).
135 "Chto zhdet Sovetskii Soiuz? Sbornik statei po povodu *Pis'ma k vozhdiam* A. Solzhenitsyna", comp. Mikhail S.Agursky, M., 1974, *AS* 2450 (*MS* 43/82). Summary in *CCE,* No. 34 (31 December 1974), pp. 77–86.
136 Andrei D.Sakharov, "On Alexander Solzhenitsyn's 'A Letter to the Soviet Leaders'", M., 3 April 1974, in *Kontinent: The Alternative Voice of Russia and Eastern Europe,* ed. Vladimir E.Maksimov (Sevenoaks, Kent, 1977), pp. 19–29 (quotations, pp. 26, 29) (*AS* 1655).

137 Aleksandr I.Solzhenitsyn, "Sakharov and the criticism of A Letter to the Soviet Leaders'", in *ibid.,* pp. 30–38 (quotation, p. 34) (Solzhenitsyn's emphasis). See Donald R.Kelley, *The Solzhenitsyn-Sakharov Dialogue: Politics, Society and the Future* (Westport, Conn., 1982).

138 Vladimir N.Osipov, "Piat' vozrazhenii Sakharovu", April 1974, *AS* 1696, in *Vestnik,* No. 111 (1974), pp. 215–19; Leonid I.Borodin, "Protiv real'nosti vo imia istiny", in "Chto zhdet Sovetskii Soiuz?", *AS* 2450, pp. 94–8; Ivanov-Skuratov, "Po povodu polemiki mezhdu Sakharovym i Solzhenitsynym", in *Veche,* No. 10, reproduced in "Chto zhdet Sovetskii Soiuz?", pp. 7–17.

139 Raisa B.Lert, "Khotim li my vernut'sia v XVI vek?", July 1974, in "Chto zhdet Sovetskii Soiuz?", pp. 106–130 (quotation, p. 110).

140 Anatoly E.Levitin-Krasnov, "Zemlia dybom", *AS* 1876, extract, as summarized in CCE, No. 34, p. 81.

141 Roy A.Medvedev, "What awaits us in the future?", 1–20 May 1974, in *Political, Social,* ed. Meerson-Aksenov and Shragin, p. 77 (*AS* 1874).

142 Lev Z.Kopelev, "A lie is conquered only by truth", in *The Samizdat Register* Vol. I, ed. Roy A.Medvedev (London, 1977), pp. 235–36. Roy Medvedev has also quoted Berdiaev with approval: Roy A.Medvedev, "The October Revolution and the problem of history as a law-governed process", in *ibid.,* pp. 4–5, 24.

143 Vladimir N.Osipov, "K voprosu o tseli i metodakh legal'noi oppozitsii", Aleksandrov, May 1974, *AS* 1760 (*MS* 26/74), in *VS,* Nos. 17–18 (1975), pp. 3–13, at pp. 5–6.

144 On Shimanov's stay in a psychiatric hospital, see Gennady M.Shimanov, "Zapiski iz Krasnogo doma", May-June 1969, *AS* 567 (*SDS* VIII), in *Grani,* No. 79 (1971), pp. 101–57; English: *Notes from the Red House* (Montreal, 1971), and Sidney Bloch and Peter Reddaway, *Russia's Political Hospitals: The Abuse of Psychiatry in the Soviet Union* (London, 1978), pp. 158–70.

145 He used the two terms "Slavophil" and "messianist" in discussions with me in 1977 and 1978.

146 Gennady M.Shimanov, "Tri otkrytykh pis'ma N.A.Struve", 1 February 1972 (=*AS* 1132), 1 September 1972 and 11 January 1973, in "Protiv techeniia" (a collection of Shimanov's writings), M., 1 February 1975, *AS* 2086, pp. 2–14. The second letter and Struve's comments appeared in *Vestnik,* Nos. 104–105 (1972), pp. 319–23.

147 Shimanov, "Otryvok iz pis'ma", n.d., in "Protiv techeniia", p. 28.

148 *Ibid.,* p. 30.

149 Shimanov, "Vera v chudo", 1972, in "Protiv techeniia", pp. 38–9.

150 *Ibid.,* pp. 36–46.

151 Gennady M.Shimanov, "Kak ponimat' nashu istoriiu i k chemu v nei stremit'sia (v sviazi s pis'mom Solzhenitsyna)", M., 2 June 1974, *AS* 1801 (*MS* 43/82), pp. 2–5 (quotation, p. 2). Agursky included the article in his compilation on Solzhenitsyn's letter, "Chto zhdet Sovetskii Soiuz?", and it was mentioned in *CCE,* No. 34, pp. 81–2.

152 Shimanov, "Kak ponimat' nashu istoriiu", pp. 4–6 (quotation, p. 6).

153 *Ibid.,* p. 9.

154 Gennady M.Shimanov, "Otryvki iz dnevnika", n.d., in "Protiv techeniia", pp. 16–17.

155 Shimanov, "Moskva—Tretii Rim", 7 August 1974, in "Protiv techeniia", pp. 106–12 (quotations, pp. 109, 110, 111).

156 Shimanov, “Ideal’noe gosudarstvo”, 29 May 1975, *AS* 2218, pp. 2–4 (quotation, p. 4).
157 Shimanov, “Otryvki iz dnevnika”, pp. 24–6.
158 Shimanov, “Kak otnosit’sia k sovetskoi vlasti (otvet V.N.Osipovu)”, M., 30 June 1974, *AS* 1846c, pp. 14–15.
159 Shimanov, “Pis’mo Natal’e Sergeevne”, 25 October 1972, in Osipov and Shimanov, “Tri pis’ma”, *AS* 1846a, pp. 3–4 (quotation, p. 3).
160 Shimanov, “Ideal’noe gosudarstvo”, pp. 5, 8. For discussions of Shimanov, see Yanov, *Russian,* pp. 113–31, and Aleksandr L.Ianov, “Ideal’noe gosudarstvo Gennadiia Shimanova”, *Sintaksis,* No. 1 (1978), pp. 31–56; David K.Shipler, *Russia: Broken Idols, Solemn Dreams* (New York, 1983), pp. 339–46.
161 Shimanov, “Pis’mo Natal’e Sergeevne”, p. 2.
162 Gennady M.Shimanov, “Iz interv’iu sotrudniku samizdatskogo zhurnala *Evrei v SSSR”, Vestnik,* No. 121 (1977), pp. 119–26.
163 Shimanov, “Osnovanie dlia nadezhdy”, M., 1 June 1976, in Keston College, document DS/1976/O/65.
164 Shimanov, “Sviateishemu Patriarkhu moskovskomu i vseia Rusi Pimenu”, open letter, M., 15 July 1976, *Vestnik,* No. 119 (1976), pp. 314–20.
165 Shimanov, “General’nomu sekretariu Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza L.I.Brezhnevu”, M., 7 August 1976, *Vestnik,* No. 119 (1976), pp. 291–3 (see also pp. 294–5).
166 For attempts to assess the extent of religious belief in the USSR, see Christel Lane, *Christian Religion in the Soviet Union: A Sociological Study* (London, 1978); Dennis J. Dunn, “Religious renaissance in the USSR”, *Journal of Church and State,* XIX, No. 1 (Winter 1977), pp. 21–36; Jane Ellis, *The Russian Orthodox Church: A Contemporary History (London,* 1986), pp. 172–86.
167 Anatoly E.Levitin-Krasnov, “Religion and Soviet youth”, *RCL,* VII, No. 4 (Winter 1979), 232–7.
168 Mikhail Meerson-Aksenov, “The Russian Orthodox Church 1965–1980”, *RCL,* IX, Nos. 3–4 (Autumn 1981), 105.
169 Metropolitan Iuvenaly, “Statement by Metropolitan Yuvenaly”, *RCL,* III, Nos. 1–3 (January–June 1975), 25.
170 See *The Orthodox Church in Russia,* ed. Archbishop Pitirim of Volokolamsk (London, 1982); *RCL,* X, No. 3 (Winter 1982), 319–20, and XI, No. 1 (Spring 1983), 75.
171 V.Furov, “Iz otcheta Soveta po delam religii—chlenam TsK KPSS. Tserkovnye kadry i mery po ogranicheniiu ikh deiatel’nosti ramkami zakona”, [1975], *Vestnik,* No. 130 (1979), pp. 275–344.
172 Anatoly E.Levitin-Krasnov, “Otets Dimitry Dudko”, *Posev,* 1975, No. 1, pp. 26–7.
173 Dimitry S.Dudko, “Kreshchenie na Rusi. (Iz dnevnika sviashchennika)”, 1961–1974, *AS* 2472, in *Vestnik,* No. 117 (1976), pp. 188–208, and No. 119 (1976), pp. 254–80.
174 Ellis, *Russian Orthodox Church: A Contemporary History,* pp. 309–15.
175 Dimitry S.Dudko, *0 nashem upovanii. Besedy, Moskva 1974* (Paris, 1975), p. 154.
176 *Ibid,* p. 106.
177 *Ibid*., pp. 103, 122, 123.
178 This and other documents are in “Delo sviashchennika Dmitriia [*sic*] Dudko. Moskva, 1974g.”, *Vestnik,* Nos 112–13 (1974), pp. 261–81.

179 See *AS* 2414–18 (MS6/76); "Delo sviashch. D.Dudko", *Vestnik,* No. 117 (1976), pp. 240–62; some of these documents in English in *RCL,* IV, No. 2 (Summer 1976), 21–31.

180 Dimitry S.Dudko, "S russkogo Golgofa", Nakhalino, 26 August 1977, in *VS,* No. 33 (1979), pp. 44–9 (quotations, pp. 44, 45, 47, 48, 49). Also in *RV,* No. 4 (1978), pp. 5–11 and No. 9 (1980), pp. 44–9. Dudko's other important articles include "O chem propovedovat'?", July–August 1977, *RV,* No. 2 (1978), pp. 10–26, and "Chto znachit mif o Rossii", *RV,* No. 10 (1980), pp. 57–65.

181 Issues of this, together with his collection "Vrag vnutri", are collected in *VS,* No. 33 (1979). Some extracts from the newspaper are in *Vestnik,* No. 127 (1978), pp. 237–47, No. 129 (1979), pp. 269–80 and No. 130 (1979), pp. 355–60.

182 Aleksandr I.Ogorodnikov, "Pis'mo Ogorodnikova Doktoru Filippu Potteru", Strunino, Vladimir oblast', 27 July 1976, in *Vestnik,* No. 119 (1976), p. 305.

183 Aleksandr I.Ogorodnikov and Boris Razveev, "Young Soviet Christians form seminar", *RCL,* VII, No. 1 (Spring 1979), 48–50 (quotation, p. 49).

184 Dimitry S.Dudko, "Otvet na pis'ma moikh dukhovnykh detei", 23 August 1976, *Vestnik,* No. 119 (1976), pp. 322, 326.

185 "Deklaratsiia printsipov Seminara", *Obshchina. Zhurnal khristianskogo seminara,* No. 2 [probably beginning of 1978], *AS* 3452 (*MS* 3/79), pp. 15–16, 17, 19, 20 and 21. Incomplete copy. Also in *VS,* No. 39 (1980), pp. 51–77; and *RV,* No. 2 (1978) , pp. 72–84, with an introduction by Vagin (pp. 69–72).

186 "Khristianskii seminar", *VS,* No. 39 (1980); Jane Ellis, "USSR: The Christian seminar", *RCL,* VIII, No. 2 (Summer 1980), 92–112; Philip Walters, "The ideas of the Christian seminar", *RCL,* IX, Nos. 3–4 (Autumn 1981), 111–26. On the Leningrad seminar and *37,* see Ellis, *Russian Orthodox Church: A Contemporary History,* pp. 391–7; "Kul'turno-dukhovnoe dvizhenie v Leningrade", *Posev,* 1977, No. 3, pp. 9–11; Viktor Krivulin and Tatiana Goricheva, "Evangel'skie dialogi", *37,* No. 1 (January 1976), reprinted in *Vestnik,* No. 118 (1976), pp. 84–6; "Pervyi nomer novogo samizdatovskogo zhurnala *37*", *Vestnik,* No. 118, pp. 316–17; N. Giriaev, "Obzor materialov opublikovannykh v samizdatovskom zhurnale *37*", *Vestnik,* No. 121 (1977), pp. 294–306; B.Grois, "Dostoevskii i Kirkegor", reprinted from *37,* in *Vestnik,* No. 123 (1977), pp. 89–110; E.Giriaev, "Religiozno-filosofskii seminar v Leningrade", reprinted from *37,* in *ibid.,* pp. 169–74; Tatiana Goricheva, "Khristianstvo i kul'tura. Zdes' i teper'. Doklad, prochitannyi na religioznofilosofskom seminare 17 fevralia 1978g.", L., *AS* 3307 (*MS* 29/78); Goricheva, same title, report to seminar, October 1977, *AS* 3329 (*MS* 33/78); Goricheva, "O neofitsial'noi kul'ture i Tserkvi", read to seminar in June 1979, *Posev,* 1979, No. 9, pp. 45–47; Goricheva, "The Religious Significance of Unofficial Soviet Culture", 16 September 1979, *RCL,* VIII, No. 3, Autumn 1980), 230–32, trans. from *37,* No. 19 (September–December 1979).

187 Liudmila Alexeyeva, *Soviet Dissent: Contemporary Movements for National, Religious and Human Rights* (Middletown, Conn., 1985), p. 445.

188 Some of these appeals are in Gleb lakunin and Lev Regelson, *Letters from Moscow: Religion and Human Rights in the USSR,* ed. Jane Ellis (Keston, Kent, 1978).

189 "Obrashchenie chlenov khristianskikh tserkvei SSSR", 20 June 1976, *AS* 2575 *(MS* 25/76), in *VS,* No. 24 (1976), pp. 63–82 and *Vestnik,* No. 118 (1976), pp. 301–13.

190 Christian Committee for the Defence of Believers' Rights in the USSR, "Deklaratsiia", Document No. I, M., 27 December 1976, *AS* 2862 (*MS* 11/77), in "Khristianskii komitet zashchity prav veruiushchikh v SSSR. Dokumenty", *VS,* No. 28 (1977), p. 4; English: *RCL,* VI, No. 1 (Spring 1978), 33–4.

191 Meerson-Aksenov, "Russian Orthodox Church", p. 104.

192 Ellis, *Russian Orthodox Church: A Contemporary History,* pp. 380–1.

193 Gleb P.Iakunin, "O sovremennom polozhenii Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi i perspektivakh religioznogo vozrozhdeniia Rossii. Doklad Khristianskomu Komitetu zashchity prav veruiushchikh v SSSR", 15 August 1979, *AS* 3751 (*MS* 38/79), in *VS,* Nos. 35–36 (1979), pp. 5–122.

194 *VS,* Nos. 35–36; Jane Ellis, "The Christian Committee for the Defence of Believers' Rights in the USSR", *RCL,* VIII, No. 4 (Winter 1980), 279–98. Some of the Committee's documents are in English in *The CCDBR Documents: Christian Committee for the Defense of Believers' Rights in the USSR,* ed. Alan Scarfe (Glendale, Cal., 1983).

195 "Delo A.Argentova", *Vestnik,* No. 119 (1976), pp. 281–95.

196 Boris Roshchin, "Svoboda religii i klevetniki", *LG,* 13 and 20 April 1977. English (part): *RCL,* V, No. 3 (Autumn 1977), 186–91.

197 "Press-konferentsiia na kvartire u o. Dmitriia Dudko 27.iv.77 g. po povodu statei v *titeraturnoi gazete* 13 i 20 aprelia s.g.", M, 27 April 1977, *AS* 3003 (*MS* 22/77).

198 Ellis, pp. 409, 417–19.

199 "Khristianskii seminar", *VS,* No. 39 (1980), pp. 110–11; Ellis, "USSR: The Christian Seminar"; Aleksandr Ogorodnikov, "Zaiavlenie dlia pressy", M., 29 May 1978, *AS* 3451 (*MS* 3/79).

200 "From the transcript of the trial of Vladimir Poresh", *RCL,* X, No. 3 (Winter 1982), 344–50; *AS* 3878 (*MS* 9/80), 3905 (*MS* 12/80), 4021–23 (*MS* 27/80); Tatiana Shchipkova, "Imeet li pravo sovetskii prepodavatel na svobodu sovesti?", *Vestnik,* No. 130 (1979), pp. 345–54; Ellis, *Russian Orthodox Church,* pp. 419–22, 427–28, and "Christian Committee", pp. 288–95; *AS* 3589 (*MS* 17/79), 3612 (*MS* 20/79), 3617 (MS 20/79), 3665–6 (*MS* 26/79), 3746–9 (*MS* 37/79), 3756–7 (*MS* 39/79), 3778–83 (*MS* 42/79), 3878 (MS 9/80), 3905 (*MS* 12/80), 3960 (*MS* 17/80), 4007 (*MS* 25/80), 4021–3 (*MS* 27/80), concern the Christian Seminar and the protests against the repression of its members; "O seminarakh A.Ogorodnikova", *Posev,* 1979, No. 2, pp. 5–7; *AS* 3957–9 (*MS* 17/80) on the Christian Committee; and documents in *Vestnik.,* Nos. 129–33 (1979–1981), especially No. 130 (1979) pp. 365–76, and No. 131 (1980), pp. 383–6, on arrests of Iakunin and Dudko.

201 Dimitry S.Dudko, "'Zapad ischet sensatsii…'", *Izvestiia,* 21 June 1980.

202 Dudko, "Otkrytoe pis'mo Ego Sviateishestvu, Sviateishemu Patriarkhu Moskovskomu i vseia Rusi Pimenu", 5 June 1980, ZhMP, 1980, No. 7, p. 40.

203 For reactions to Dudko's broadcast, see *CCE,* No. 57 (3 August 1980), pp. 38–42; Aleksandr Kiselev, "Chto proizoshlo s ottsom Dmitriem?", *RV,* No. 10 (1980), p. 66; Nikita A.Struve, "Chto sluchilos' s o. Dimitriem Dudko?", *Vestnik,* No. 132 (1980), pp. 230–2; a response from Dudko was Dimitry S.Dudko, "Pis'mo ot o. D.Dudko", 7 July 1981, *Vestnik,* No. 133 (1981), p. 293; Anatoly E.Levitin-Krasnov, "O tekh, kogo nedavno sudili", *Posev,* 1980, No. 11, pp. 45–7, on the role of the Patriarchate; Balis Gagauskas, "Koe chto o Dudko", Kuchino camp, Perm, 1980, *AS* 4327 (*MS* 23/81), accusing Dudko of betraying the priests who were martyred in the camps; Viktor Vardomtsev, "Vozmozhno li raskaianie ili

samoogranichenie bez proshcheniia?", M., March 1981, *AS* 4362 (*MS* 26/81), asking forgiveness for Dudko.

204 Ellis, *Russian Orthodox Church: A Contemporary History,* pp. 439–44; *CCE,* No. 58 (November 1980), pp. 18–32.

205 *Mnogaia leta,* Nos. 1 and 2, at Keston College; John B.Dunlop, "*Mnogaya leta:* Advocate of a Russian Church—Soviet State Concordat", *RCL,* XI, No. 2 (Summer 1983), 146–60.

8
Andropov and Chernenko against Russian nationalism

1 Georgy N.Vladimov, "Chto proiskhodit v strane", *Posev,* 1983, No. 7, pp. 26–7; Zhores A.Medvedev, *Andropov* (Oxford, 1983), p. 118.

2 Valery D.Solovei, "Russkii natsionalizm i vlast' v epokhu Gorbacheva", in *Mezhnatsional'nye otnosheniia v Rossii i SNG. Seminar Moskovskogo Tsentra Karnegi*. Vyp. I: *doklady 1993–1994 gg*., ed. Paul Goble and Gennady Bordiugov (M., 1994), p. 58.

3 On *Xadethda* and its closure, see AS 4714 (*MS* 30/82), 4725–7 (*MS* 32/82) and *AS* 4758 (*MS* 38/82); *Vestnik,* No. 137 (1982), pp. 261–71, and *RCL,* XI, No. 2 (Summer 1983), 210–13). Issues of *Nadezhda* have been published in Frankfurt by Possev; excerpts from Nos. 2–6 are in *VS,* No. 44 (1981).

4 Mario Corti, "Repressive Measures against two Russian Nationalists", RL 265/82 (30 June 1982).

5 Vladimov, "Chto proiskhodit", p. 28.

6 Iulia Vishnevskaia, "The arrest of Sergei Semanov", RL 416/82 (18 October 1982); Semyon Reznik, "Kto takoi Sergei Semanov?", *Novaia gazeta* (New York), 11–17 December 1982.

7 Iuliia Vishnevskaia, "The case of Leonid Borodin—A Stalinist show trial", RL 199/83 (19 May 1983). The novels included *Tret'ia pravda* (Frankfurt, 1981).

8 Natalia Aleksandrova, "V dni podpol'ia i zakliucheniia. Zapad k nam nikakogo uchastiia ne proiavil, vspominaet Leonid Borodin", *NG,* 16 July 1999.

9 Oxana Antic, "Vladimir Poresh—A Victim of the Law on 'Malicious Disobedience' in Soviet Camps", RL 72/85 (6 March 1985).

10 Vasily I.Kuleshov, "Tochnost' kriteriev", *Pravda,* 1 February 1982.

11 Some of these are reviewed in U.Guralnik and S.Dmitrenko," 'God Dostoevskogo' (Po stranitsam literaturnykh zhurnalov)", *VL,* 1982, No. 5, pp. 191–216.

12 Iury I.Seleznyov, *Vmire Dostoevskogo* (M., 1980), and *Dostoevski* (*M.,* 1981).

13 Mikhail P.Lobanov, "Naiti v cheloveke cheloveka", *Oktiabr',* 1981, No. 8, pp. 206–10.

14 Vadim V Kozhinov, "'…i nazovet menia vsiak sushchii v nei iazyk'. Zametki o svoeobrazii russkoi literature", NS, 1981, No. 11, pp. 155–76 (the phrase "Russian idea" appears on p. 160).

15 Dostoevsky, as cited in *ibid.,* p. 154.

16 Kozhinov, "'…i nazovet'", pp. 154–5.

17 *Ibid.,* p. 164.

18 Kuleshov, "Tochnost' kriteriev", *Pravda,* 1 February 1982.

19 Kozhinov, "'… i nazovet'", p. 173.

20 *Ibid.,* pp. 170–76.
21 Sergei Iurenen, "Iurii Kuznetsov i drugie: pravyi marsh", *Strelets,* 1984, No. 8, pp. 20–2; Iury P.Kuznetsov, *Russkii uzel. Stikhotvoreniia i poemy* (M., 1983), p. 15.
22 Vladimir A.Soloukhin, "Kameshki na ladoni", *NS,* 1981, No. 3, p. 39.
23 "Pochta zhurnala: iiul'-dekabr' 1981 goda", *Kommunist,* 1982, No. 2 (January), pp. 127–8.
24 *Kommunist,* 1982, No. 8 (May), p. 128.
25 *NS,* 1982, No. 10, p. 176. Further discussion of the treatment given to *Nash sovremennik* at this time is in John B.Dunlop, *The New Russian Nationalism* (New York, 1985), pp. 19–25.
26 "V Tsentral'nom Komitete KPSS", *Pravda,* 30 July 1982.
27 *The Guardian,* 8 December 1982.
28 Pyotr L.Proskurin, "Rossiia. Slovo zavetnoe", *Pravda,* 5 December 1982.
29 Iury V.Andropov, "Shest'desiat let SSSR. Doklad General'nogo sekretaria TsK KPSS tovarishcha lu.V.Andropova na sovmestnom torzhestvennom zasedanii Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS, Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR i Verkhovnogo Soveta RSFSR v Kremlevskom Dvortse s"ezdov, 21 dekabria 1982 goda", *PZh,* 1983, No. 1 (January), pp. 5–9.
30 *Ibid*.
31 Roman Solchanyk, "Andropov and the Supreme Soviet on the National Question", RL 27/83 (13January [1983]), p. 2.
32 Konstantin U.Chernenko, "Shest'desiat let bratskoi druzhby narodov", *PMiS,* 1982, No. 12, p. 11.
33 Konstantin U.Chernenko, "Aktual'nye voprosy ideologicheskoi, massovo-politicheskoi raboty partii", *Pravda,* 15 June 1983; lury V.Andropov, "Rech' General'nogo sekretaria TsK KPSS tovarishcha lu.V.Andropova na plenume Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS 15 iiunia 1983 goda", *Pravda,* 16 June 1983.
34 Konstantin U.Chernenko, "Utverzhdat' pravdu zhizni, vysokie idealy sotsializma", *LG,* 26 September 1984.
35 Brian Appleyard, "The Crosses Yuri Lyubimov Bears", *The Times,* 5 September 1983; Richard Owen, "Lyubimov Expelled by Soviet Party", *ibid.,* 24 March 1984; Peter Nichols, "Soviet Film Director Defecting to West", *ibid.,* 10 July 1984.

9
Gorbachev and the end of the empire

1 For discussions of Russian nationalism under Gorbachev, see John B.Dunlop, *The Rise of Russia and the Fall of the Soviet Empire,* new edn (Princeton, N.J., 1995); Walter Laqueur, *Black Hundred: The Rise of the Extreme Right in Russia* (New York, 1993); Stephen K.Carter, *Russian Nationalism: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow* (London, 1990); Roman Szporluk, "Dilemmas of Russian nationalism", *PC,* XXXVIII, No. 4 (July-August 1989), pp. 15–35; "Russian nationalism today", *RLRB* special edn., 19 December 1988; and reports in *RLRB* and its successor, *Report on the USSR*. On the development of informal groups, see Geoffrey Hosking, *The Awakening of the Soviet Union,* 2nd edn. (London, 1991); Geoffrey Hosking, Jonathan Aves and Peter J.S. Duncan, *The Road to Post-Communism: Independent Political Movements in the Soviet Union, 1985–1991* (London, 1992).

2 Leonid I.Brezhnev, "Otchet Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS XXVI s"ezdu", *LG,* 25 February 1981.
3 Aleksandr Prokhanov, "Zapiski na brone", *LG,* 28 August 1985, and "Formuly i gipotezy", *LG,* 6 November 1985.
4 Prokhanov, "Zapiski".
5 Sergei Khovansky, "Afghanistan: the bleeding wound", *Detente,* No. 6 (Spring 1986), pp. 2–4.
6 Col. O.Ivanov (retd.), "Geroicheskoe proshloe nashei Rodiny", *KVS,* 1985, No. 11, pp. 72–8.
7 Prokhanov, "Formuly".
8 For example, *Veche,* No. 1 (see p. 91) and the contributions of the *derevenshchiki* Valentin Rasputin and Evgeny Nosov in *Trezvost'-norma zhizni* (M., 1984).
9 "Lozh' o 'p'ianoi' Rusi", *Sov Ros,* 14 July 1985.
10 Valentin Rasputin, "Pozhar. Povest'", *MS,* 1985, No. 7, pp. 3–38.
11 "Spustia vosem' vekov", *Kommunist,* 1985, No. 10 (July), pp. 45–59, especially p. 46.
12 "Eshche o 'proekte veka'", *Grani,* No. 133 (1984), pp. 190–268.
13 Bess Brown, "USSR is Going Ahead with 'Sibaral'", RL 194/85 (7 June 1985).
14 D.Likhachev and V.Ianin, members of the Presidium of the Central Council of VOOPIiK, "Russkii Sever kak pamiatnik otechestvennoi i mirovoi kul'tury", *Kommunist,* 1986, No. 1 (January), pp. 115–19.
15 "Osnovnye napravleniia ekonomicheskogo i sotsial'nogo razvitiia SSSR na 1986–1990 gody i na period do 2000 goda", *Pravda,* 9 March 1986.
16 "VIII s"ezd pisatelei SSSR. Vystupleniia uchastnikov s"ezda", *LG,* 2 July 1986.
17 "V Politbiuro TsK KPSS", *Pravda,* 16 August 1986. See also Nicolai N.Petro, "'The Project of the Century': A case study of Russian national dissent", *SCC,* XX, Nos. 3–4 (Autumn-Winter 1987), 235–52.
18 *Pravda,* 7 March 1986.
19 M.S.Gorbachev, "Politicheskii doklad Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS XXVII s"ezdu Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza. Doklad General'nogo sekretaria TsK KPSS tovarishcha M.S.Gorbacheva 25 fevralia 1986g.", *Pravda,* 26 February 1986.
20 Pamiat', Council, "Obrashchenie patrioticheskogo istoriko-literaturnogo ob" – edineniia 'Pamiat" k russkomu narodu, k vsem narodam nashei velikoi derzhavy, zhelaiushchim sokhranit' otechestvo svoe ot pozhara", 21 May 1986, *AS* 6079 (*MS* 37/87).
21 Pamiat', seven members of the Council (Kim Andreev *et al.*), "Vozzvanie patrioticheskogo ob"edineniia 'Pamiat" k russkomu narodu, k patriotam vsekh stran i natsii", M., 8 December 1987, *AS* 6138 (*MS* 5/88), p. 2.
22 *Ibid.,* especially pp. 5, 13 (quotation), 14 (quotation).
23 For example, Pavel Gutiontov, "Podmena", *Izvestiia,* 27 February 1988; "Chto proiskhodit v Rumiantsevskom sadu?", *Leningradskaia pravda,* 12 August 1988.
24 Andrei Cherkizov, "O podlinnykh tsennostiakh i mnimykh vragakh", *SK,* 18 June 1987.
25 Aleksandr Shtilmark, "'Pamiat": my za dukhovnoe vozrozhdenie Otechestva", *Sobesednik,* No. 23, June 1989; also the reply by Pavel Kudiukin, "Broskie odezhdy psevdopatriotov", *ibid*. On Pamiat', see also V.D.Solovei and I.A.Erunov, *Russkoe delo segodnia,* Bk I, *Pamiat*' (M., 1991); William Korey, *Russian*

Antisemitism, Pamyat and the Demonology of Zionism (Chur, 1995); Laqueur, *Black Hundred,* ch 13; Howard Spier, "Soviet antisemitism unchained: the rise of the 'Historical and Patriotic Association Pamyat'", Institute of Jewish Affairs *Research Report,* No. 3 (July 1987); Iuliia Vishnevskaia, "The emergence of Pamyat" and 'Otechestvo'", RL 342/87 (26 August 1987); Taras Kuzio, "Glasnost and Russian nationalism", *SNS,* IV, No. 9 (September 1987), 1–3, and "Russian culture or anti-semitism: what does 'Pamyat' stand for?", *SNS,* V No. 9 (September 1988), 1–3.

26 Oleg V.Volkov, "Zametki o glasnosti", M., May–June 1986, *AS* 5761, p. 7.
27 "List of Prematurely Released in 1986–1987", *USSR NB* special supplement, 15 July 1987.
28 Irena Maryniak, "*Samizdat* Today—A Review", *RCL,* XVII, No. 2 (Summer 1989), 123–4.
29 *USSR NB,* 30 November 1987, item 22–54.
30 *Ibid.,* item 22–6.
31 Vladimir N.Osipov, "Gvozd' perestroiki", Tarusa, August 1987, *Veche* (Munich), No. 31 (1988), p. 139.
32 *USSR NB,* 30 November 1987, item 22–41.
33 Information taken from photocopies of unpublished documents of the Christian Patriotic Union, headed "Perestroike—russkii dukh, russkuiu silu!"
34 Viktor Aksiuchits, "Russkaia ideia", M., 1985–February 1988, *AS* 6243 (*MS* 33/88), p. 25. Published in *Vybor. Literaturno-filosofskii zhurnal russkoi khristianskoi kul'tury,* No. 3, M., January–March 1988.
35 Aksiuchits, p. 40.
36 Leonid I.Borodin, "Barguzin", *LR,* 13 May 1988.
37 "'Russkaia ideia': problemy kul'tury—problemy kinematografa", *Iskusstvo kino,* 1988, No. 6, p. 119.
38 *Ibid.,* p. 126.
39 *Ibid.,* p. 122.
40 *Ibid.,* p. 124.
41 Igor R.Shafarevich, "Rusofobiia", *NS,* 1989, No. 6, pp. 167–92, and No. 11, pp. 162–72.
42 Aleksandr I.Solzhenitsyn, "Zhit' ne po Izhi", 12 February 1974, afterword Igor Vinogradov, *Vek XX i mir,* 1989, No. 2, pp. 22–5.
43 "Sergei Zalygin: We'll Start by Publishing Archipelago—Such is its Author's Will", *MN,* 16 July 1989.
44 John B.Dunlop, "The contemporary Russian nationalist spectrum", in *Russian Nationalism Today,* pp. 1–11. See also Iuliia Vishnevskaia, "*Nash sovremennik* Provides Focus for 'Opposition Party'", *Report on the USSR,* 20 January 1989, pp. 1–6.
45 "Pis'mo v Pravdu", *Pravda,* 18 January 1989.
46 Vadim V.Kozhinov, "'Samaia bol'shaia opasnost'…'", *NS,* 1989, No. 1, pp. 141–79. Lobanov's article "Posleslovie", in the April 1988 issue, defending the role of Anatoly Nikonov and *Molodaia gvardiia* in the 1960s, was also part of this campaign.
47 *Ibid.*
48 Mikhail F.Antonov, "Uskorenie: vozmozhnosti i pregrady", *NS,* 1986, No. 7, pp. 3–20, especially pp. 15–17.

49 Vladimir A.Soloukhin, "Pochemu ia ne podpisalsia pod tem pis'mom", *NS,* 1988, No. 12, pp. 186–9.
50 Vasily I.Belov, "Vse vperedi. Roman", *NS,* 1986, No. 7, pp. 29–106, No. 8, pp. 59–110. On village prose, see also Deming Brown, *The Last Years of Soviet Russian Literature: Prose Fiction 1975–1991* (Cambridge, 1993), ch. iv; Kathleen F.Parthé, *Russian Village Prose: The Radiant Past* (Princeton, N.J., 1992).
51 Belov, "God velikogo pereloma. Khronika deviati mesiatsev", *NM,* 1989, No. 3, pp. 6–95. This was a sequel to *Kanuny* (see p. 75), the third part of which appeared in *Novyi mir* in August 1987. The fact that *Novyi mir* published the story probably has more to do with the journal's desire to maintain its traditional links with the *derevenshchiki* than with sympathy for the idea of the "conspiracy".
52 Igor Vinogradov, "Vasily Belov's Crossroads", *MN,* 30 April 1989.
53 Valentin G.Rasputin," 'Zhertvovat' soboiu dlia pravdy'. Protiv bespamiatstva. Vystuplenie na V s"ezde Vserossiiskogo obshchestva okhrany pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury (g. Gor'kii, iiul', 1987 g.)", *NS,* 1988, No. 1, pp. 169–76
54 Kozhinov," 'Samaia bol'shaia opasnost'…'", p. 170.
55 Evgeny A.Evtushenko, "False Alarm", *MN,* 5 February 1989.
56 Iuliia Vishnevskaia, "Ligachev, 'Pamyat',' and Conservative Writers", *Report on the USSR,* 10 March 1989, pp. 12–15. See also Rasputin's defence of Ligachev at the CPD in May-June 1989: Valentin G.Rasputin, "Vystuplenie na S"ezdc narodnykh deputatov SSSR", *NS*, 1989, No. 8, p. 134.
57 *Moskovskii literator,* Nos. 49–50, 16 December 1988, p. 3, as cited in John B.Dunlop, "Two noteworthy Russian Nationalist initiatives", *Report on the USSR,* 26 May 1989, p. 2.
58 Douglas Smith, "Moscow's 'Otechestvo': a link between Russian Nationalism and Conservative opposition to reform", *ibid.,* 28 July 1989, pp. 6–9.
59 Dunlop, "Two noteworthy Russian Nationalist initiatives", pp. 1–4.
60 Douglas Smith, "Formation of new Russian nationalist group announced", *Report on the USSR,* 7 July 1989, pp. 5–8.
61 Rasputin, "Vystuplenie na S"ezde narodnykh deputatov", pp. 133–6 (quotations, p. 135).
62 Grani Gusakov, "Estonia: No Agreement So Far", *MN,* 20 August 1989.
63 "Russia's Premier Calls for Republican Cost-Accounting", *Soviet News* (London), 2 August 1989, p. 260.
64 "Leningrad Communists Favour Radical Democratisation", *ibid.,* 30 August 1989, p. 288.
65 "Narashchivat' intellektual'nyi potentsial perestroiki. Vystuplenie M.S.Gorbacheva" [speech to cultural leaders, 6 January 1989], *Pravda,* 8 January 1989.
66 "Mikhail Gorbachev's Address to the Congress of People's Deputies", 30 May 1989, *Soviet News,* 7 June 1989, p. 187.
67 "Vystuplenie General'nogo sekretaria TsK KPSS, Predsedatelia Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR M.S.Gorbacheva po Tsentral'nomu televideniiu", *Pravda,* 2 July 1989.
68 "Soviet Communist Party's Nationalities Policy", *Soviet News,* 23 August 1989, p. 279.
69 Victor Zaslavsky, "The evolution of separatism in Soviet society under Gorbachev", in *From Union to Commonwealth: Nationalism, and Separatism in*

the Soviet Republics, ed. Gail W.Lapidus and Victor Zaslavsky with Philip Goldman (Cambridge, 1992), pp.84–5.

70 "Sovet partii s narodom. Vstrechi M.S.Gorbacheva s trudiashchimsia Krasnodarskogo i Stavropol'skogo kraev", *Pravda,* 19 September 1986.

71 "Vstrecha General'nogo sekretaria TsK KPSS M.S.Gorbacheva s Patriarkhom Moskovskim i vseia Rusi Pimenom i chlenami Sinoda Russkoi pravoslavnoi tserkvi", *Pravda,* 30 April 1988; Jane Ellis, *The Russian Orthodox Church: Triumphalism and Defensiveness* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 157–65.

72 On the role of the Moscow Patriarchate in promoting Russian nationalism, see my "Orthodoxy and Russian nationalism in the USSR, 1917–1988", in *Church, Nation and State in Russia and Ukraine,* ed. Geoffrey A.Hosking (Basingstoke, 1991), pp. 312–32.

73 Vladimir S.Solovyov, "Stat'i i pis'ma", comp. R.Galtseva, intro. Sergei S.Averintsev, *NM,* 1989, No. 1, pp. 194–234, especially p. 211.

74 Nikolai A.Berdiaev, "Chelovek i mashina. (Problema sotsiologii i metafiziki tekhniki)", intro. Evgeny V.Barabanov, *VF,* 1989, No. 2, pp. 143–62. (First published in *Put'* [Paris], No. 38, May 1933, pp. 3–37.)

75 Leonty G.Byzov and Nikolai V.Lvov, "Perestroika: politicheskoe soznanie i sotsial'nye otnosheniia", *Vek XX i mir,* 1989, No. 3, pp. 10–18, especially p. 12.

76 Hosking, Aves and Duncan, *Road,* pp. 83–8.

77 Richard Sakwa, "Christian democracy in Russia" *RSS,* XX, No. 2 (1992), 135–200.

78 Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, 'Kak nam obustroit' Rossiiu?', in both *KP* and *LG,* 18 September 1990. English: *Rebuilding Russia* (*New York,* 1991).

79 'Slovo k narodu', *Sov Ros,* 23 July 1991.

80 For an analysis of the coup, see Archie Brown, *The Gorbachev Factor* (Oxford, 1996), ch. 8.

81 Dunlop, *Rise of Russia,* pp. 256–76.

82 Ilya Prizel, *National Identity and Foreign Policy: Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia and Ukraine* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 422.

10
Post-Soviet Russia

1 For a fuller discussion, see Vera Tolz, "Conflicting 'homeland myths' and nation-state building in postcommunist Russia", *SR,* LVII, No. 2 (Summer 1998), pp. 267–94, and Tolz, "Forging the nation: national identity and nation building in post-Communist Russia", *EAS,* L, No. 6 (September 1998), 993–1022. The best book on post-Soviet Russian politics is Richard Sakwa, *Russian Politics and Society,* 2nd edn (London, 1996).

2 Paul Kolstoe, *Russians in the Former Soviet Republics* (London, 1995); Neil Melvin, *Russians beyond Russia: The Politics of National Identity* (London, 1995); Jeff Chinn and Robert Kaiser, *Russians as the New Minority: Ethnicity and Nationalism in the Soviet Successor States* (*Boulder,* Colo., 1996).

3 A leading advocate of the strategy of creating a civic Russian identity was Valery Tishkov, Director of the Institute of Anthropology and Ethnology of the Russian Academy of Sciences and Russian Minister of Nationalities from February to

October 1992. See Valery Tishkov, *Ethnicity, Nationalism and Conflict in and after the Soviet Union: The Mind Aflame* (London, 1997).

4 *Konstitutsiia Rossiiskoi Federatsii. Proekt* (M., 1993), p. 3 and ch. 3.

5 Roy Allison, "Military factors in foreign policy", in Neil Malcolm, Alex Pravda, Roy Allison and Margot Light, *Internal Factors in Russian Foreign Policy* (Oxford, 1996), ch. 5, especially pp. 271–5. For the debates on Russian foreign policy interests, see Margot Light, "Foreign policy thinking", in *ibid.,* ch. 2; Hannes Adomeit, "Russian national security interests", in *Security Dilemmas in Russia and Eurasia,* ed. Roy Allison and Christoph Bluth (London, 1998), ch.2; Iver B.Neumann, *Russia and the Idea of Europe* (London, 1996), pp. 179–93; Ilya Prizel, *National Identity and Foreign Polity: Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia and Ukraine* (Cambridge, 1998), chs 6, 7.

6 "Obrashchenie k grazhdanam Rossii orgkomiteta Fronta Natsional'nogo Spaseniia", *SovRos,* 1 October 1992.

7 "Vozrodim i ukrepim velikoe bratstvo", *Vestnik FNS,* No. 3 (1993).

8 Jonathan Steele, *Eternal Russia: Yeltsin, Gorbachev and the Mirage of Democracy* (London, 1995),ch. 16.

9 Anatol Lieven, *Chechnya: Tombstone of Russian Power* (New Haven, Conn., 1998); John B.Dunlop, *Russia Confronts Chechnya: Roots of a Separatist Conflict* (Cambridge, 1998).

10 Tim McDaniel, *The Agony of the Russian Idea* (Princeton, N.J., 1996), pp. 10–11.

11 N.V.Sinitsyna, *Tretii Rim. Istoki i evoliutsiia russkoi srednevekovoi kontseptsii (XV–XVI vv.)* (M., 1998), and a more general history, R.G.Skrynnikov, *Tretii Rim* (SPb., 1994).

12 *Russkaia ideia,* comp. M.A.Maslin (M., 1992) and *V poiskakh svoego puti: Rossiia mezhdu Evropoi i Aziei. Khrestomatiia po istorii rossiiskoi obshchestvennoi mysli XIX i XX vekov,* comp. N.G.Fedorovsky, 2nd edn (M., 1997) are anthologies; Arseny V.Gulyga, *Russkaia ideia i ee tvortsy,* Seriia izbrannykh biografii (M., 1995) is an analysis.

13 Evgeny Troitsky, *Vozrozhdenie russkoi idei. Sotsial'no-Jilosofskie ocherki*(M., 1991), pp. 212–13.

14 Viktor Aksiuchits, *Ideokratiia v Rossii. Metamorfozy bogoborcheskogo rezhima* (M., 1995), p. 149.

15 *Ibid.,* pp. 13–14.

16 Jane Ellis, *The Russian Orthodox Church: Triumphalism and Defensiveness* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 128–44,108–13.

17 Aleksandr I.Solzhenitsyn, *The Russian Question at the End of the 20th Century,* trans. Yermolai Solzhenitsyn (London, 1995), p. 99. First published in *Novyi mir,* 1994.

18 *Ibid.,* pp. 93–108 (quotation, p. 106).

19 Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, "As lacking in public responsibility as the Communist regime", *Transition,* 10 January 1997, pp. 50–2, 56 (quotation, p. 50).

20 Vladimir Zhirinovsky, *Poslednii brosok na iug* (M., 1993), pp. 63–6, 117.

21 Robert Service, "Zhirinovskii: ideas in search of an audience", in *Russian Nationalism, Past and Present,* ed. Geoffrey Hosking and Robert Service (Basingstoke, 1998), p. 196.

22 Stephen White, Richard Rose and Ian McAllister, *How Russia Votes* (Chatham, N.J., 1997), p. 123.

23 On the KRO, see Alan Ingram, "'A Nation Split into Fragments': The Congress of Russian Communities and Russian Nationalist Ideology", *EAS,* LI, No. 4 (June 1999), 687–704.
24 White *et al., How Russia Votes,* p. 260.
25 Aleksandr I.Lebed, *Za Derzhavy obidno…* (Kirov, 1995); Harold Elletson, *The General against the Kremlin. Alexander Lebed: Power and Illusion* (London, 1998).
26 White *et al., How Russia Votes,* p. 123.
27 Gennady A.Ziuganov, *Veriu v Rossiiu* (Voronezh, 1995), pp. 368–9.
28 Gennady A.Ziuganov, *My Russia: The Political Autobiography of Gennady Zyuganov,* ed. Vadim Medish (Armonk, NY, 1997), p. 10.
29 Gennady A.Ziuganov, *Rossiia i sovremennyi mir* (M., 1995).
30 Michael Urban "Remythologising the Russian State", *EAS,* L, No. 6 (September 1998), 969–92, 978.
31 Ziuganov, *Rossiia i sovremnnyi mir,* pp. 16–18.
32 Gennady A.Ziuganov, *Drama vlasti: Stranitsy politicheskoi avtobiografii* (M., 1993), p. 177.
33 Ziuganov, *Rossiia i souremennyi mir,* pp. 55–7.
34 *Ibid.,* pp. 86–8.
35 *Ibid.,* p. 94.
36 Ziuganov, *Drama vlasti,* pp. 181–2.
37 Ziuganov, *Rossiia i sovremennyi mir,* p. 75.
38 *Sovremennaia Russkaia Ideia i Gosudarstvo,* chief ed. Gennady A.Ziuganov, chief author Aleksei I.Podberezkin (M., 1995), pp. 40–1.
39 Gennady A.Ziuganov, "Rossiia i mir", in *ibid.,* p. 26. The explanations in brackets are by Ziuganov.
40 See Joan Earth Urban and Valerii D.Solovei, *Russia's Communists at the Crossroads* (Boulder, Colo., 1997).
41 *Ibid.,* p. 133. Also Richard Sakwa, "The Communist Party of the Russian Federation and the Electoral Process", *Studies in Public Policy* 265, Glasgow, 1996, p. 10.
42 Ziuganov, *Veriu v Rossiiu*.
43 *Ibid.,* p. 364.
44 White *et al., How Russia Votes,* p. 224.
45 *Ibid.,* pp. 257–9.
46 Visiting Poklonnaia gora in August 1995, I was greeted at the entrance by an exhibit of a statement on the world-historic significance of the Soviet defeat of German fascism, signed by J.V.Stalin. See also R.W.Davies, *Soviet History in the Yeltsin Era* (Basingstoke, 1997), pp. 7 3–80.
47 Mark Webber, *CIS Integration Trends: Russia and the Former Soviet South* (London, 1997), especially pp. 14–16.
48 *Rossiiskaia gazeta,* 11 June 1996.
49 White *et al., How Russia Votes,* pp. 260, 267.
50 Urban, "Remythologising the Russian State", *EAS,* L, No. 6 (September 1998), p. 969.
51 Metroplitan Ioann of St Petersburg, "The West wants chaos", in *Christianity after Communism: Social, Political and Cultural Struggle in Russia,* ed. Niels C.Nielsen (Boulder, Colo., 1994), pp. 107–12.

52 See issues of the Keston Institute journal *Frontier* from 1997 for details of the law and its implementation.
53 Nikolai Ivanov, "Protiv vsekh, krome Ziuganova", *NG,* 1 September 1999.
54 Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, "Zakon-Taiga", *NG,* 10 April 1999.
55 James Meek, "The Cap Fits for Russia's Chirac", *The Observer,* 16 February 1997.
56 Anatol Lieven, "The weakness of Russian nationalism", *Survival,* XLI, No. 2 (Summer 1999), 53–70.

Conclusion

1 Vasily O.Kliuchevsky, *Kurs russkoi istorii,* III (M., 1937; first published 1911), 11, as cited in Robert C.Tucker, "Swollen state, spent society: Stalin's legacy to Brezhnev's Russia", *FA,* LX, No. 2 (Winter 1981–1982), 417.
2 Pyotr Abovin-Egides, "Zhit' imperiei", *Poiski* (Paris), No. 3 (1981), p. 60. (First published in the Moscow samizdat *Poiski*.)
3 *Ibid.,* p. 64.
4 Mikhail Kheifets, "Russkii patriot Vladimir Osipov", *Kontinent,* No. 28 (1981), p. 164.

Bibliography

Note

James H.Billington's mammoth study of Russian culture, *The Icon and the Axe,* is a valuable introduction to the context of Russian messianism. Geoffrey Hosking's indispensable *Russia: People and Empire* focuses on nation-building. No student can ignore the work of Hans Kohn, the author of many books and articles on Russian thought, pan-Slavism and nationalism in general. Kohn is particularly noteworthy for having considered Russian messianism in a comparative context. The monographs of Hildegard Schaeder and Nicolas Zernov have discussed "Moscow, the Third Rome". Michael Cherniavsky's *Tsar and People* deals with the evolution of two central myths of Russian messianism up to 1917: the myth of the Tsar as the "saintly ruler", which is linked with the "Third Rome" idea, and the myth of "Holy Russia", which expresses the idea of the chosen people. Three works by Westerners specifically address themselves to the theme of Russian messianism: Emmanuel Sarkisyanz's *Russland und der Messianismus des Orients,* Gugliemo Guariglia's *Il Messianismo russo* and Vatro Murvar's long article "Messianism in Russia: religious and revolutionary". These three share with Nikolai Berdiaev a concern with relating the messianism of pre-revolutionary Russia to Bolshevism and the Soviet State. Guariglia and Sarkisyanz (in the first half of his book) provide useful surveys of Russian messianism. (The second half of Sarkisyanz's book concerns the relationship between Russian messianism and messianism in a number of Asian religions.) Murvar's article is devoted to enumerating the common characteristics shared by religious messianisms and revolutionary messianisms in Russia.

A particularly useful source for some of the main writings of classical Slavophilism is the volume compiled by Nikolai Brodsky, *Rannye slavianiofily*. Editions of the collected works of the Slavophils and their successors were published in the nineteenth century in Russia and have been republished there, beginning in the 1970s and accelerating since the inception of *glasnost*'. As far as secondary sources are concerned, the works of Nicholas Riasanovsky, Andrzej Walicki and Peter Christoff on Slavophilism deserve particular note. Riasanovsky's *Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles* remains valuable, and his volume on Nicholas I lays out the social, political and ideological environment which gave birth to Slavophil doctrine. Walicki's *Slavophile Controversy* is a thoroughgoing analysis of the influences on Slavophilism, of the ideas of its main exponents, and of the trends of thought

which developed from it. On pan-Slavism, the volumes by Hans Kohn and Michael Petrovich are useful. Nikolai Tsimbaev's monograph on Ivan Aksakov benefits from access to Moscow archives. The series "Zhizn' zamechatel'nykh liudei" has brought out biographies of Tiutchev and Dostoevsky. Joseph Frank's study of the latter (four volumes so far) is well respected.

Berdiaev's ideas on Russian messianism and its link with Russian communism are in *The Russian Idea* and *The Origin of Russian Communism*. From a different perspective, Mikhail Agursky discusses the nationalist elements in Stalinism in *Ideologiia natsional-bol'shevizma*. His volume *The Third Rome,* despite its title, is in fact an expanded translation of the previous volume, focusing on National Bolshevism. Iver Neumann's *Russia and the Idea of Europe* and Ilya Prizel's *National Identity and Foreign Policy* provide historical surveys of Russian attitudes towards the West, extending into Eltsin's era. Milan Hauner's *What is Asia to Us?* performs a similar service on Russian attitudes to Asia up to Gorbachev. The best source for the study of the rebirth of Russian national consciousness is probably the journal *Novyi mir,* especially from 1952 to 1970. Dina Spechler's volume is the most detailed investigation of this. Since the Brezhnev era, the journals *Molodaia gvardiia, Moskva* and *Nash sovremennik,* the newspaper *Sovetskaia Rossiia,* and, in the 1990s, Aleksandr Prokhanov's newspapers *Den*' and then *Zavtra* have been the main carriers of Russian nationalist thought. The works by Dimitry Pospielovsky and John Dunlop, and Aleksandr Ianov's *The Russian New Right,* are the most important secondary sources on Russian nationalism under Brezhnev. Stephen Carter's *Russian Nationalism* and Walter Laqueur's *Black Hundred* emphasize the extremist trends in contemporary Russian nationalism. The late Jane Ellis wrote the best studies of *The Russian Orthodox Church* in two separate books.

The leading primary source on dissent under Brezhnev was the samizdat bimonthly *Chronicle of Current Events*. Despite the dangerous conditions in which it was produced, the editors managed to maintain a high level of accuracy. The most thorough analysis of trends of thought in samizdat was for a long time Ferdinand Feldbrugge's volume, although it was published relatively early in the development of the human rights movement. It has, perhaps, now been overtaken by Liudmila Alekseeva's longer book, *Soviet Dissent,* written by a former participant in the Moscow Helsinki Monitoring Group. The main sources for the development of Russian messianism in samizdat are the Russian nationalist journals, especially *Veche, Zemlia* and *Moskovskii sbornik*. Vladimir Osipov's *Tri otnoshmiia k Rodine* is a convenient collection. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's programmatic writings—*A Letter to the Soviet Leaders* and the co-authored *From Under the Rubble* are indispensable, as is his memoir of struggle against the *apparat, The Oak and the Calf*. Other memoirs of particular relevance to the Russian nationalist movement are those by Levitin-Krasnov and Mikhail Kheifets (on Osipov). Among the various samizdat anthologies in English, the most useful for Russian messianism is *The Political, Social and Religious*

Thought of Russian "Samizdat", edited by the *émigrés* Mikhail Meerson-Aksenov and Boris Shragin.

The principal archives of samizdat material, both of which I visited, are the Radio Liberty Arkhiv samizdata, now at the Central European University, Budapest, and the archives at Keston Institute, now in Oxford. Both archives are well organized. Keston concentrates on religious samizdat. It regularly published a bibliography of new material, in *Religion in Communist Lands,* from 1972 to Autumn 1981 (although only a select bibliography after Autumn 1978). After that it periodically produced lists of new material. The Arkhiv samizdata is much more comprehensive, but it should not necessarily be considered to be a representative collection of all the samizdat in circulation in the Soviet Union. Writers or groups who had more contacts with foreigners, and thus more opportunities to send their documents to the West, are likely to be over-represented in comparison with those for whom Western links were not important. Furthermore, some writers may have expressed the desire that the Arkhiv not hold their material, because they did not want to be associated with Radio Liberty. The Arkhiv samizdata initially published its holdings in the *Sobranie dokumentov samizdata,* and later in the weekly bulletin *Materialy samizdata*.

Émigré journals that are particularly useful sources for Russian Orthodox samizdat are the Paris *Vestnik Russkogo Studencheskogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia* (which since No. 111 has outgrown the *Studencheskogo in* its title); the NTS Frankfurt publications, *Posev, Grani* and (to 1981) *Vol'noe slovo*; and the newer journals, *Russkoe vozrozhdenie* (Paris and New York) and *Veche* (Munich). These journals are also useful sources of information on current developments in Russia. The most useful periodicals in English for the subjects covered here are: the Radio Liberty *Research Bulletin,* renamed since the beginning of 1989 *Report on the USSR* (the Russian version sometimes included material not in the English edition)—from 1992 this was incorporated in the *RFE/RL Research Bulletin* (and later succeeded by the journals *Transition* and *Transitions*); Radio Liberty's *Current Abstracts*; the invaluable *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet* [formerly *Soviet*] *Press*; Keston Institute's *Religion in Communist Lands,* now *Religion, State and Society* and the magazine *Frontier;* the publications of the Institute for Jewish Policy Research (London), *Soviet Jewish Affairs,* now *East European Jewish Affairs* and *Insight: Soviet Jews;* the *USSR News Brief* (Munich); and *Index on Censorship* (London).

The most useful books on the end of the USSR and the emergence of the Russian Federation are Archie Brown's *The Gorbachev Factor* and Dunlop's *The Rise of Russia and the Fall of the Soviet Empire.* Thomas Parland's *Rejection in Russia…*is an excellent study of anti-Westernism in Russian thought up to the early Eltsin years. The writings of Ziuganov, Zhirinovsky and Lebed and Aksiuchits give a flavour of Russian politics in the 1990s. Among Internet sources the e-mail periodicals *RFE/RL Newsline* (www.rferl.org), Jamestown Foundation *Prism* (www.jamestown.org) and *Russian Regional Report* (www.iews.org) provide accurate information on current developments in Russia.

In this bibliography, the traditional division between primary and secondary sources has not been followed; for my purposes, Soviet discussions of historical topics such as the battle of Kulikovo Field, which might be regarded as secondary sources, are treated as primary sources, since my interest in them arises from what they reveal about the views of Soviet writers. No method of dividing this bibliography would be completely satisfactory. I have the following sections: bibliographies; works on messianism, nationalism and socialism outside Russia; writings on pre-revolutionary Russia, where I have included general works on Russia; writings on 1917 and the period since, which includes Soviet publications on the Tsarist period whose chief relevance is what they convey about the Soviet period; and samizdat writings. I have excluded newspaper articles (other than those I think especially important) and Radio Liberty reports. I have listed English translations of Russian originals where I am aware of them; the version I cite first is normally the version I used. I have given American and Canadian publishers as well as British where possible.

Bibliographies

Akademiia nauk SSSR (1975) Institut nauchnoi informatsii po obshchestvennym naukam. I.L.Belenky, T.P.Gavrilova, E.I.Serebrianaia and Iu.V.Tseitlin (comp.) *Istoriia russkoi filosofii. Ukazatel' literatury, izdannoi v SSSR na russkom iazyke za 1917–1967 gg*. 3 pts. Moscow: INION AN SSSR.

—(1981) *Istoriia russkoi filosofii. Ukazatel' literatury, izannoi v SSSR na russkom iazyke v 1968–1977 gg.,* I.L.Belenky and E.I.Serbrianaia (comp.), 2 pts. Moscow: INION AN SSSR.

Altshuler, Mordechai (ed. and Intro.), Pinkus, Binyamin and Greenbaum, Alfred A. (comp.) (1970) *Russian Publications on Jews and Judaism in the Soviet Union 1917–1967: A Bibliography,* Jerusalem: Society for Research on Jewish Communities and the Historical Society of Israel.

American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies The (1996) Annual, (pre-1966: *The American Bibliography for Russian and East European Studies*) prepared at Library of Congress; most recent volume is for 1993, Armonk, N.Y. and London: M.E.Sharpe

Arkhiv samizdata (1977) *Register of Documents 1977 Edition, with Quick-Reference Document Locator,* Munich: Samizdat Archive Association.

Bibliographical Guide to Slavic, Baltic and Eurasian Studies (1995) [formerly *Bibliographical Guide* to Soviet and East European Studies] Boston, Mass.: Hall (most recent edition is 1994, 3 vols).

Biographical Dictionary of Dissidents in the Soviet Union, 1956–1975 (1982) S.P. de Boer, E.J. Driessen and H.L.Verhaar (comp.), The Hague: Nijhoff.

Boilard, Steve D. (1997) *Reinterpreting Russia: An Annotated Bibliography of Russia, the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation*, *1991–1996,* (Magill Bibliographies), Lanham, Md. and London: Scarecrow; Pasadena, Cal.: Salem.

Boiter, Albert (ed.) (1971) *Five Years of Samizdat: A Bibliography,* Munich.

Crowther, Peter A. (1969) *A Bibliography of Works in English on Early Russian History to 1800* Oxford: Blackwell.

Deutsch, Karl W. and Merritt, Richard L. (1970) *Nationalism and National Development: An Interdisciplinary Bibliography,* Cambridge, Mass., and London: MIT.

"Dissent in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe: Bibliography of a Book Exhibit in the Robarts Library Sept. 10 Nov. 10 1976", University of Toronto Robarts Library, mimeo.

European Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies (1999) [formerly of *Soviet, East European and Slavonic Studies*], Annual, most recent edition is vol. XX, 1994, Paris: Editions de l'école des hautes études en sciences sociales. Institut d'Etudes slaves.

Fletcher, William C. (1963) *Christianity in the Soviet Union: An Annotated Bibliography and List of Articles. Works in English,* Los Angeles: Research Institute on Communist Strategy and Propaganda, School of International Relations, University of Southern California.

Golan Galia, and Shafir Michael, (1971) *Bibliography for the Study of the Communist World,* Jerusalem: [Hebrew University].

Horak, Stephan M. (1978, 1982, 1987) *Russia, the USSR and Eastern Europe: A Bibliographical Guide to English Language Publications, 1964–1974* (same for *1975–1980* and *1981–1985*), Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited.

——(1985) *The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe: A Bibliographical Guide to Recommended Books for Small and Medium-sized Libraries and School Media Centers,* Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited.

Horecky, Paul L. (1965) *Russia and the Soviet Union: A Bibliographic Guide to Western-Language Publications,* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Hosking, Geoffrey A. (1973) "Selected bibliography of recent village prose in the Soviet Union", *ABSEES* (Glasgow), IV, 2 (October 1973: special section),

Iurdina, R.M. and Burkhanova, E.I. (1976) *Natsional'nyi vopros i natsional'nye otnosheniia v SSSR. Bibliograficheskii ukazatel' literatury 1963–1973 gg.,* Dushanbe: Tadzhikskii gosudarstvennyi universitet.

Kolarz, Waiter (1963) *Books on Communism: A Bibliography,* 2nd edn, London: Ampersand.

Pitman, Lesley (1994) *Russia/USSR: World Bibliographical Series,* vol VI, 2nd edn, Oxford and Santa Barbara, Cal.: Clio.

"Publications in Western Languages on the Human Rights Movement in the USSR: A Select Bibliography" (1972, 1973), *CCE,* 22/23:101–7; supplemented in *CCE* 27: 345–52. London: Amnesty International Publications.

Schaffner, Bradley L. (1995) *Bibliography of the Soviet Union: Its Predecessors and Successors* (Scarecrow Area Bibliographies), Metuchen, N.J. and London: Scarecrow.

Schultheiss, Thomas (ed.) (1972) *Russian Studies 1941–1958: A Cumulation of the Annual Bibliographies from The Russian Review,* Ann Arbor, Mich.: Pierian.

Shapiro, David (1962) *A Select Bibliography of Works in English on Russian History 1801–1917,* Oxford: Blackwell.

Sullivan, Helen F. and Burger, Robert H. (1994) *Russia and the Former Soviet Union: A Bibliographical Guide to English-Language Publications, 1986–1991,* Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited.

Terry, Garth M. (1978) *East European Languages and Literatures: A Subject and Name Index to Articles in English-Language Journals, 1900–1977,* Oxford and Santa Barbara, Cal.: Clio.

Thompson, Anthony (1979) *Russia/USSR: A Selective Bibliography of Books in English,* Oxford and Santa Barbara, Cal.: Clio.

Whetten, Lawrence L. (1976) *Current Research in Comparative Communism: An Analysis and Bibliographic Guide to the Soviet System,* New York, Washington, D.C., and London: Praeger.

Woll, Josephine and Treml, Vladimir G. (1983) *Soviet Dissident Literature: A Critical Guide,* Boston, Mass.: Hall.

Vasileva, T.A. (ed.), Gavrilenko, N.V. (comp.) (1977) *Natsional'nye otnosheniia v SSSR na sovremennom etape. Bibliograficheskii ukazatel',* Moscow: Gosudarstvennaia ordena Lenina biblioteka SSSR im. V.I.Lenina. Informatsionno-bibliograficheskii otdel.

Messianism, nationalism and socialism outside Russia

Anzulovic, Branimir (1999) *Heavenly Serbia: From Myth to Genocide,* London: Hurst.

Benjamin, Walter (1992 [1940]) "Theses on the philosophy of history", in Hannah Arendt (ed. and intro.) *Illuminations,* Harry Zohn (trans.) London: Fontana (pp. 245–55). (First published in *Neue Rundschau,* LXI: 3 (1950).)

Ben-Sasson, H.H. and Ettinger, S. (eds) (1971) *Jewish Society through the Ages,* London: Valentine, Mitchell.

Bible: all quotations follow the Authorized Version (King James).

Bloom, Solomon F. (1967) *The World of Nations: A Study of the National Implications in the Work of Karl Marx,* New York: AMS Press (reprint of New York: Columbia UP, 1941 edn).

Capp, Bernard S. (1972) *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism,* London: Faber.

Carr, E.H. *et al.* (1939) *Nationalism: A Report by a Study Group of Members of the Royal Institute of International Affairs,* London, New York, Toronto: OUR

Cohn, Norman (1962) *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Messianism in Medieval and Reformation Europe and its Bearing on Modern Totalitarian Movements,* London: Mercury.

Davis, Horace B. (1967) *Nationalism and Socialism: Marxist and Labor Theories of Nationalism to 1917,* New York and London: Monthly Review Press.

Greenfeld, Liah (1992) *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Hosking, Geoffrey and Schöpflin, George (eds) (1997) *Myths and Nationhood,* London: Hurst/SSEES.

Kedourie, Elie (1966) *Nationalism,* 3rd edn, London: Hutchinson.

Klausner, Joseph (1956) *The Messianic Idea in Israel from its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah,* trans. W.F.Stinespring, London: Allen and Unwin (New York: Macmillan, 1955).

Kohn, Hans (1933) "Messianism", *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences,* vol. X, New York: Macmillan (pp. 356–64).

Levin, Michael (1981) "Deutschmarx: Marx, Engels and the German question", *PS,* XXIX (4) (October): 537–54.
Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich (1956–1968) *Werke (MEW),* 39 vols, Berlin: Dietz.
——(1973) *The Revolutions of 1848* (The Pelican Marx Library), David Fernbach (ed. and intro.), Harmondsworth UK: Penguin.
——(1975–) *Collected Works (MECW),* trans. Jack Cohen *et al.,* 50 vols, London: Lawrence and Wishart/New York: International Publishers/Moscow: Progress.
Mowinckel, Sigmund (1959) *He That Cometh,* trans. G.W.Anderson, Oxford: Blackwell.
Scholem, Gershom G. (1971) *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality,* New York: Schocken.
Shafer, Boyd C. (1972) *Faces of Nationalism: New Realities and Old Myths,* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
Smith, Anthony D. *(1979) Nationalism in the Twentieth Century,* Oxford: Martin Robertson.
——(1991) *National Identity,* London, New York, Toronto: Penguin.
Talmon, Jacob L. (1960) *Political Messianism: The Romantic Phase,* London: Seeker & Warburg.
——(1981) *The Myth of the Nation and the Vision of Revolution: The Origins of Ideological Polarization in the Twentieth Century,* London: Seeker & Warburg.
Talmon, Yonina (1962) "Pursuit of the millennium: the relation between religious and social change", *AES* III(1):125–48.
——(1966) "Millenarian movements", *AES* VII(2):159–200.
Walicki, Andrzej (1994) *Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism: The Case of Poland,* Notre Dame, Ind.:Univ of Notre Dame Press.
——(1995) *Marxism and the Leap to the Kingdom of Freedom: The Rise and Fall of the Communist Utopia,* Stanford, Cal.: Stanford UP.
Werblowsky, R.J.Zwi (1974) "Messiah and messianic movements", *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* 15th edn, Macropaedia, XI:1017–22.

Pre-revolutionary Russia

Acton, Edward (1979) *Alexander Herzen and the Role of the Intellectual Revolutionary,* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
Aksakov, Ivan S. (1886) *Sochineniia I.S.Aksakova* (3 vols, 1886–1891), Vol. I: *Slavianskii vopros 1860–1886. Stat'i iz "Dnia", "Moskoy", "Moskvicha" i "Rusi". Rechi v Slavianskom Komitete v 1876, 1877 i 1878,* Moscow: Volchaninov.
——(1900) *Sochineniia I.S.Aksakov. Pol'skii vopros i zapadno-russkoe delo. Evreiskii vopros. 1860–1886. Start iz "Dnia", "Moskvy", "Moskvicha" i "Rusi",* Vol. III, 2nd edn, St Petersburg: Izd. Imperatorskoi publichnoi biblioteki.
——(1988) *Pis'ma k rodnym, 1844–1849,* T.F.Pirozhkova (ed.) (Literaturnye pamiatniki), Moscow: Nauka.
Aksakov, Konstantin S. (1861) *PSS,* Vol. I: *Sochineniia istoricheskie,* Moscow: Bakhmeter.
Aksakov, Konstantin S. and Aksakov, Ivan S. (1981) *Uteraturnaia kritika,* comp. A.S.Kurilov (Liubiteliam rossiiskoi slovesnosti), Moscow: Sovremennik.
Andreyev, Nikolay (1959) "Filofey and his epistle to Ivan Vasil'yevich", *SEER* XXXVIII (90) (December): 1–31.

Baehr, Stephen L. (1978) "From history to national myth: *Translatio imperil* in eighteenth-century Russia", *RR,* XXXVII (1) January): 1–13.

Barsukov, Nikolai P. (1894) *Zhizn' i trudy M.P.Pogodina,* Vol. VIII (22 vols), St Petersburg: Stasiulevich.

Berdiaev, Nikolai A. (1912) *Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov,* Moscow: Mamontov.

——(1957) *Dostoievsky,* trans. Donald Attwater, New York: Meridian.

Berlin, Sir Isaiah (1978) *Russian Thinkers,* Henry Hardy and Aileen Kelly (eds) (intro. Aileen Kelly), London: Hogarth.

Berline, Paul (1947) "Russian religious philosophers and the Jews (Soloviev, Berdyaev, Bulgakov, Struve, Rozanov and Fedotov)", *Jewish Social Studies* IX(4) (October): 271–318.

Billington, James H. (1958) *Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism,* London: OUR

——(1970) *The Icon and the Axe: An Interpretive History of Russian Culture,* New York: Vintage.

Black, Cyril E. (ed.) (1960) *The Transformation of Russian Society: Aspects of Social Change since 1861,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Martha and Rosenthal, Bernice G. (eds) (1982) *A Revolution of the Spirit: Crisis of Value in Russia, 1890–1918,* Newtonville, Mass.: Oriental Research Partners.

Brodsky, Nikolai L. (comp.) (1910) *Rannie slavianofily. A.S.Khomiakov, I.V.Kireevskii, K.S. i I.S. Aksakovy,* Moscow: Sytin.

Brym, Robert J. (1978) *The Jewish Intelligentsia and Russian Marxism: A Sociological Study of Intellectual Radicalism and Ideological Divergence,* London: Macmillan.

Bulgakov, Sergei N. (1911) *Dva grada. Issledovaniia o prirode obshchestvennykh idealov,* 2 vols, Moscow: Mamontov.

Byrnes, Robert F. (1968) *Pobedonostsev: His Life and Thought,* Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press.

Cahm, Eric and Fišera, Vladimir G. (1978–80) *Socialism and Nationalism,* 3 vols, Nottingham: Spokesman.

Carr, Edward H. (1962) *Dostoevsky 1821–1881,* London: Allen & Unwin.

Chaadaev, Pyotr la. (1966) *The Major Writings of Peter Chaadaev: A Translation and Commentary,* comp. Raymond T.McNally, intro. Richard Pipes, Notre Dame, Ind., and London: University of Notre Dame Press.

Chaev, N.S. (1945) "'Moskva—Tretii Rim' v politicheskoi praktike moskovskogo pravitel'stva XVI veka", *Istoricheskie zapiski* XVII: 3–23.

Cherniavsky, Michael (1958) "'Holy Russia': a study in the history of an idea", *AHR* LXIII(3) (April): 617–37.

——(1959) *"Khan* or *Basileus:* an aspect of Russian mediaeval political theory", *JHI* XX (4) (October–December): 459–76.

——(1969) *Tsar and People: Studies in Russian Myths,* 2nd edn, New York: Random House.

Chmielewski, Edward (1962) *Tribune of the Slavophiles: Konstantin Aksakov,* Gainesvillc: University of Florida Press.

Christoff, Peter K. (1961–1991) *An Introduction to Nineteenth-Century Russian Slavophilism: A Study in Ideas.* Vol. I: *A.S.Xomjakov;* Vol. II: *I.V.Kireevsky,* The Hague: Mouton (1961, 1972); Vol. III: *K.S.Aksakov,* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press (1982); [Vol. IV]: *Iu.F.Samarin,* Boulder, Golo. and Oxford: Westview 1991.

Cornwell, Neil (1986) *The Life, Times and Milieu of V.F.Odoyevsky, 1804–1869* (foreword: Sir Isaiah Berlin), London: Athlone.

Danilevsky, Nikolai Ia. (1966 [1894]) *Rossiia i Evropa. Vzgliad na kul'turnye i politicheskie otnosheniia Slavianskogo mira k Germano-Romanskomu* (with essay by K.N.BestuzhevRiumin, intro. by lury Ivask), Nikolai N.Strakhov (ed.), New York and London: Johnson Reprint (reprint of 5th edn, St Petersburg: Strakhov).

Debreczeny, Paul and Zeldin, Jesse (eds and trans.) (1970) *Literature and National Identity: Nineteenth-Century Russian Critical Essays* (intro. Debreczeny), Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Dementev, Aleksandr G. (1969) "'Kontseptsiia', 'konstruktsiia' i 'model'", *VL* 7:116–29 (Slavophilism).

Dmitriev, Sergei S. (1969) "Podkhod dolzhen byt' konkretno-istoricheskii", *VL* 12:73–84 (Slavophilism).

——(1976) "Slavianofily", *Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia,* 3rd edn, XXIII: 550–1.

Dostoevsky, Fyodor M. (1928–1959) *Pis'ma v chetyrakh tomakh,* ed. A.S.Dolinin M.-L.: Gosizdat, Academia, Khudozhestvennaia literatura.

——(1949) *Dnevnik pisatelia & 1873 god; …za 1876 god; …za 1877 god,* 3 vols, Paris: YMCA Press, n.d. English: *The Diary of A Writer,* trans. Boris Brasol, 2 vols, New York: Scribner's/London: Cassell.

——(1971) "Neizdannyi Dostoevskii. Zapisnye knizhki i tetradi 1860–1881gg.", *LN,* Vol. LXXXIII

——(1971) *The Devils,* trans. and intro. David Magarshack, Harmondsworth UK and Baltimore, Md: Penguin.

——(1972–) *PSS v tridisati tomakh,* AN SSSR, Institut russkoi literatury (Pushkinskii dom), Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoe otdelenie.

——(1977) *The Brothers Karamazov,* 2 vols, trans. and intro. David Magarshack, Harmondsworth UK, New York, Toronto: Penguin.

Dowler, E.Wayne (1982) *Dostoevsky, Grigor'ev and Native Soil Conservatism,* Toronto, Buffalo, New York, London: University of Toronto Press.

Edelman, Robert (1980) *Gentry Politics on the Eve of the Russian Revolution: The Nationalist Party, 1907–1917,* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Edie, James M., Scanlan, James P. and Zeldin, Mary B. (eds, with collaboration of George L.Kline) (1965) *Russian Philosophy,* 3 vols., Chicago: Quadrangle.

Egorov, B.F. (1969) "Problema, kotoruiu neobokhodimo reshit'", *VL* 5:128–35 (Slavophilism).

——(1987) "Slavianofil'stvo", *Literaturnyi entsiklopedicheskii slovar',* Moscow: Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia (pp. 384–5).

Eidelman, Natan Ia. (1983) *Poslednii letopisets,* Moscow: Kniga (Karamzin).

Eikalovich, Father Superior Gennady (1977) "Evreiskii messianizm", *Vestnik* 121: 77–110.

——(1979) "Chto takoe 'messianizm'? (Prolog k Russkomu Messianizmu)", *GZ,* 13: 26–31.

——(1981) "Liubomudry i slavianofily", *NZh* 142:206–20.

——(1983) "O nekotorykh messianskikh motivakh y S.N.Bulgakova", *NZh* 152 (September): 284–301.

Fadner, Frank L. (1962) *Seventy Tears of Pan-Slavism in Russia: Karazin to Danilevskii, 1800–1870,* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Fedorovsky, N.G. (comp.) (1997) *Vpoiskakh svoego puti: Rossiia mezhdu Evropoi iAziei. Khrestomatiia po istorii rossiiskoi obshchestvennoi mysli XIX i XX vekov,* 2nd edn, Moscow: Logos.

Fennell, John L.I. (1961) *Ivan the Great of Moscow,* New York: St. Martin's Press/ London: Macmillan.

Field, Daniel (1976) *Rebels in the Name of the Tsar,* Boston, Mass., and London: Houghton Mifflin.

Florinsky, Michael T. (1953) *Russia: A History and an Interpretation,* 2 vols, New York: Macmillan.

Frank, Joseph (1976) *Dostoevsky: The Seeds of Revolt, 1821–1849,* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

——(1984) *Dostoevsky: The Years of Ordeal, 1850–1859,* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

——(1987) *Dostoevsky: The Stir of Liberation, 1860–1865,* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

——(1995) *Dostoevsky: The Miraculous Years, 1865–1871,* London: Robson.

Frankel, Jonathan (1981) *Prophecy and Politics: Socialism, Nationalism and the Russian Jews, 1862–1917,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frizman, L.G. (1969) "Za nauchnuiu ob"ektivnost'", *VL* 7:138–52 (Slavophilism).

Fyodorov, Nikolai F. (1982) *Sochineniia* Svetlana G.Semyonova (ed. and intro.), AN SSSR. Institut filosofii. (Filosofskoe nasledie, Vol. LXXXV) Moscow: Mysl'.

Gleason, Abbott (1972) *European and Muscovite: Ivan Kireevsky and the Origins of Slavophilism,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

——(1983) *Young Russia: The Genesis of Russian Radicalism in the 1860s,* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Gogol, Nikolai V. (1966–7) *Sob. soch. v semi tomakh,* S.I.Mashinsky, N.L.Stepanov and M.B. Khrapchenko (eds), Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura.

——(1969) *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends,* trans. Jesse Zeldin, Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Press.

Goldstein, David (1980) *Dostoievsky and the Jews* (foreword: Joseph Frank), Austin and London: University of Texas Press.

Golubev, A.N. (1978–9) "Poniatie lichnosti v etike Vladimira Solov'eva", *VF* 3:125–36 (English: SSPXVII(3): 44–65).

Gregg, Richard A. (1965) *Fedor Tiutchev: The Evolution of a Poet,* New York and London: Columbia University Press.

Grishin, D.V. (1974) "Byl li Dostoevskii antisemitom?", *Vestnik* 114:73–88.

Grossman, Leonid P. (1934) "Dostoevskii i pravitel'stvennye krugi 1870-kh godov", *LN* XV: 83–162.

——(1974) *Dostoevsky: A Biography,* trans. Mary Mockler, London: Allen Lane.

Guarilgia, Guglielmo (1956) *Il Messianismo russo,* Rome: Editrice Studium.

Gulyga, Arseny V. (1995) *Russkaia ideia i ee tvortsy,* Seriia izbrannykh biografii, Moscow: Soratnik.

Haberer, Erich E. (1995) *Jews and Revolution in Nineteenth-Century Russia,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hare, Richard (1951) *Pioneers of Russian Social Thought,* London: OUP.

Herzen, Aleksandr I. (1954–65) *Sob. soch. v tridtsati tomakh,* AN SSSR. Institut mirovoi literatury im. A.M.Gor'kogo, Moscow: Izd. AN SSSR.

Hingley, Ronald (1962) *The Undiscovered Dostoievsky,* London: Hamish Hamilton.

Hosking, Geoffrey (1997) *Russia: People and Empire, 1552–1917,* London: HarperCollins.
Hunczak, Tomas (ed.) (1974) *Russian Imperialism from Ivan the Great to the Revolution* (intro. Hans Kohn), New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press,
Ianov, Aleksandr L. (1969) "Otvet opponentam", *VL* 12:85–101 (Slavophilism).
——(1970 [1969]) "Slavianofily i Konstantin Leont'ev (Russkaia konservativnaia mysl' XIX v. i ee interpretatory)", *VF*8:97–106 (English: *SSP* IX(2) (Fall 1970): 152–76.
——(1976 [1969]) "Zagadka slavianofil'skoi kritiki", *VL* 5:91–116 (English: *International Journal of Sociology* VI(2–3) (Summer-Fall 1976): 184–219.
Ivanov, A.M. (1969) "Otritsatel'noe dostoinstvo", *VL* 7:129–38 (Slavophilism.)
[Ivanov, Aleksandr] (1985) *Alexander Ivanov,* Photo-album, comp. and intro. Militsa Nekliudova, trans. Iury Panfilov (Masters of World Painting), Leningrad: Aurora.
Karpovich, Michael (1946) "Vladimir Soloviev on nationalism", *RP* VIII(2) (April): 183–91.
Khomiakov, Aleksei S. (1878) *PSS Alekseia Stepanovicha Khomiakova,* 2nd edn, Vol. I, Moscow: Lebedev.
——(1900–14) *PSS Alekseia Stepanovicha Khomiakova,* 4th edn (8 vols. bound in 4), Moscow: Kushnerev.
——(1969) *Stikhotooreniia i dramy,* B.F.Egorov (ed. and Intro.) (Biblioteka poeta.), Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', Leningradskoe otdelenie.
Khomiakov, Aleksei S. and Palmer, William (1969 [1895]) *Russia and the English Church during the Last Fifty Years. Vol. I: Containing a Correspondence between Mr. William Palmer, follow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and M.Khomiakoff, in the Years 1844–1854,* W.J.Birkbeck (ed.), Farnborough, Hants: Gregg (reprint of 1895 edn, London: Rivington, Percival for the Eastern Church Association).
Kireevsky, Ivan V. (1970 [1911]) *PSS I.V.Kireevskogo v dvukh tomakh,* Mikhail O.Gershenzon (ed.), Farnborough, Hants: Gregg (reprint of 1911 edn, Moscow: Tip. Imperatorskogo Moskovskogo Universiteta).
——(1979) *Kritika i estetika,* comp. and intro. lu.V.Mann (Istoriia estetiki v pamiatnikakh i dokumentakh), Moscow: Iskusstvo.
——(1984) *Izbrannye stat'i,* comp. and intro. V.A.Kotelnikov (Liubiteliam rossiiskoi slovesnosti), Moscow: Sovremennik.
Klier, John D. (1980) "The Jewish question in the reform era Russian press, 1855–1865", *RR*XXXIX(3) July): 301–19.
Klier, John D. and Lambroza, Shlomo (eds) (1992) *Pogroms: Anti-Jewish Violence in Modern Russian History,* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
Kohn, Hans (ed.) (1955) *The Mind of Modern Russia: Historical and Political Thought of Russia's Great Age,* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
Kohn, Hans (1946) *Prophets and Peoples: Studies in Nineteenth Century Nationalism,* New York: Macmillan.
Koshelyov, Viacheslav A. (1984) *Esteticheskie i literaturnye vozzreniia russkikh slavianojilov (1840–1850-e gody),* AN SSSR. Institut russkoi literatury (Pushkinskii dom), Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoe otdelenie.
Kovalevsky, Pierre (1958) "Messianisme et Millénarisme russes?" *Archives de sociologie des religions,* 5 (January–June): 47–70.
Kozhinov, Vadim V. (1969) "O glavnom v nasledii slavianofilov", *VL* 10:113–31.
Kuleshov, Vasily I. (1969) "Slavianofil'stvo, kak ono est'…" *VL* 10:131–44.
——(1976) *Slavianofily i russkaia literatura,* Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura.

Kurbsky, Prince Andrei M., and Tsar Ivan IV (1955) *The Correspondence between Prince A.M. Kurbsky and Tsar Ivan IV of Russia, 1564–1579,* ed. and trans. John L.I.Fennell, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levitsky, Sergei (1980) "Missionizm, ne messianizm!", *RV* 11:77–90.

Lomunov, K.N. (ed.) (1978) *Literaturnye uzgliady i tvorchestvo slavianofilov (1830–1850 gody),* AN SSSR. Institut mirovoi literatury im. A.M.Gor'kogo, Moscow: Nauka.

Lomunov, K.N., Grishunin, A.L., Guralnik, U.A. and Nechaeva, VS. (eds) (1972) *Dostoevskii. Khudozhnik i myslitel'. Sbornik statei,* AN SSSR, Institut mirovoi literatury imeni A.M.Gor'kogo, Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura.

Lotman, Iu. M. and Uspensky, B.A. (1982) "Otzvuki kontseptsii 'Moskva—tretii Rim' v ideologii Petra Pervogo (k probleme srednevekovoi traditsii v kul'ture barokko)", in V.A.Karpushchin (ed.) *Khudozhestvennyi iazyk srednevekov'ia,* Moscow: Nauka (pp. 236–49).

Lukashevich, Stephen (1965) *Ivan Aksakov, 1823–1886: a study in Russian thought and politics,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

——(1977) *N.F.Fedorov (1828–1903): a study in Russian eupsychian and Utopian thought,* Newark: University of Delaware Press/London: Associated University Presses.

Lunacharsky, Anatoly V. (1908) *Religiia i sotsializm,* Pt. I, St Petersburg: Shipovnik.

MacMaster, Robert E. (1967) *Danilevsky: A Russian Totalitarian Philosopher,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Magarshack, David (1969) *Gogol: A Life,* New York: Grove.

Maimin, E.A. (1969) "Nuzhny konkretnye issledovaniia", *VL*(10)*:* 103–113 (Slavophilism).

Malia, Martin E. (1961) *Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism, 1812–1855,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press/London: OUP

Martin, Neil A. (1968) "Marxism, nationalism and Russia", *JHI* XXIX(2) (April–June): 231–52.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich (1953) *The Russian Menace to Europe by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: A Collection of Articles, Speeches, Letters and News Dispatches,* Paul W.Blackstock and Bert F.Hoselitz (eds), London: Allen & Unwin.

Masaryk, Tomáš G. (1955–67) *The Spirit of Russia: Studies in History, Literature and Philosophy,* 3 vols (Vols. I and II trans. Eden and Cedar Paul; additional chs. by Jan Slavik, trans. W.R. and Z.Lee; Vol. III ed. George Gibson, trans. Robert Bass), 2nd edn, London: Allen & Unwin.

Mashinsky, S.I. (ed. and intro.) (1964) *Poety kruzhka N.V.Stankevicha. N.V.Stankevich, V.I. Krasov, K.S.Aksakov, I.P.Kliushnikov,* Moscow/Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel'.

Mashinsky, S.I. (1969) "Slavianofil'stvo i ego istolkovateli (nekotorye itogi diskussii)", *VL* 12:102–40.

Maslin, M.A. (comp.) (1992) *Russkaia ideia,* Moscow: Respublika.

Medlin, William K. (1952) *Moscow and East Rome: A Political Study of the Relations of Church and State in Muscovite Russia* (Pref. S.Stelling-Michaud), Geneva: Droz.

Mikhailovsky, Nikolai K. (1978 [1882]) *Dostoevsky: A Cruel Talent,* trans. Spencer Cadmus, Ann Arbor, Mich.: Ardis (first published in *Otechestvennye zapiski* 9–10).

Miliukov, Pavel N. (1902) *Iz istorii russkoi intelligentsia Sbornik statei i etiudov,* St Petersburg: Znanie.

——(1943) *Outlines of Russian Culture. Pt I: Religion and the Church,* ed. Michael Karpovich, trans. Valentine Ughet and Eleanor Davis, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Miller, David B. (1979) "The Velikie Minei Chetii and the Stepennaia Kniga of Metropolitan Makarii and the origins of Russian national consciousness", *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* XXVI:263–382.

Mochulsky, Konstantin V. (1967) *Dostoevsky: His Life and Work,* trans. and intro. Michael A. Minihan, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Moser, Charles A. (ed.) (1972) "Russia: the spirit of nationalism", *Review of National Literatures* (Special issue) III(1) (Spring).

Moss, Walter G. (1970) "Vladimir Soloviev and the Jews in Russia", *RR* XXIX(2) (April): 181–91.

Murvar, Vatro (1971) "Messianism in Russia: religious and revolutionary", *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* X(4) (Winter): 277–338.

Nabokov, Vladimir V. (1961) *Nikolai Gogol,* corr. edn, New York: New Directions.

Obolensky, Dmitri (1950) "Russia's Byzantine heritage", *Oxford Slavonic Papers* I*:* 37–63.

Odoevsky, Prince Vladimir F. (1982) *0 literature i iskusstve,* ed. and intro. VI. Sakharov. (Liubiteliam rossiiskoi slovesnosti), Moscow: Sovremennik.

Owen, Thomas C. (1981) *Capitalism and Politics in Russia: A Social History of the Moscow Merchants, 1855–1905, C*ambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Petrovich, Michael B. (1956) *The Emergence of Russian Panslavism, 1856–1870,* New York: Columbia University Press.

Pipes, Richard (1959) *Karamzin's Memoir on Ancient and Modern Russia: A Translation and Analysis,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Pletnev, R. (1976) "Zametki k stat'e D.V.Grishina 'Byl li Dostoevskii antisemitom?'", *Vestnik* 117:118–20.

Pokrovsky, Mikhail N. (1970) *Russia in World History: Selected Essays,* ed. and intro. Roman Szporluk, trans. Roman Szporluk and Mary Ann Szporluk, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Pokrovsky, S.A. (1969) "Mnimaia zagadka", *VL* 5:117–28 (Slavophilism).

Pomper, Philip (1972) *Peter Lavrov and the Russian Revolutionary Movement,* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Prochazka, Helen Y. (1985) "On concepts of patriotism, loyalty and honour in the old Russian military accounts", *SEER L*XIII(4) (October): 481–97.

Pushkin, Aleksandr S. (1962) *Sochineniia v trekh tomakh,* ed. A.Saakiants, Moscow: Gos. izd. khudozhestvennoi literatury.

Putnam, George F. (1977) *Russian Alternatives to Marxism: Christian Socialism and Idealistic Liberalism in Twentieth-Century Russia,* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Radoyce, Lubomir (1976) "Writer in hell: notes on Dostoevsky's letters", *CalSS* IX: 71–122.

Raeff, Marc (ed.) (1966) *Russian Intellectual History: An Anthology* (intro. Sir Isaiah Berlin), New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Rahv, Philip (1938) "Dostoevsky and politics: notes on The Possessed'", *PR* V(2) (July): 25–36.

Read, Christopher J. (1979) *Religion, Revolution and the Russian Intelligentsia, 1900–1912: The Vekhi Debate and its Intellectual Background,* London: Macmillan.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas V. (1952) *Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophils: A Study of Romantic Ideology,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

——(1957) "Pogodin and Sevyrev in Russian Intellectual History", *Harvard Slavic Studies* IV:149–67.

——(1959) *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825–1855,* Berkeley: University of California Press.

——(1963) "Review of M.Cherniavsky, *Tsar and People", Political Science Quarterly* LXXVIII(2) (June): 304–5.

——(1976) *A Parting of Ways: Government and the Educated Public in Russia, 1801–1855,* Oxford, New York, Toronto: Clarendon.

——(1977) *A History of Russia, 3*rd edn, New York: OUP

——(1985) *The Image of Peter the Great in Russian History and Thought,* New York and Oxford: OUP.

Riha, Thomas (ed.) (1964) *Readings in Russian Civilization,* Vol. III, 1st edn, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

——(1969) *Readings in Russian Civilization,* Vols I and II, 2nd edn, rev., Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Roberti, Jean-Claude (1984) "La Resurrection de Moscou Troisième Rome ou la face cachée du projet fédorovien", in "L'utopie dans le monde slave", *RES* LVI(I): 7–154 (at pp. 79–85).

Rogger, Hans (1960) *National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

——(1962) "Nationalism and the State: a Russian dilemma", *Comparative Studies in Society and History* IV(3) (April): 253–64.

——(1986) *Jewish Policies and Right-Wing Politics in Imperial Russia, L*ondon: Macmillan for St Antony's.

Rossing, Niels and Rønne, Birgit (1980) *Apocryphal—Not Apocryphal? A Critical Analysis of the Discussion concerning the Correspondence between Tsar Ivan IV Groznyj and Prince Andrej Kurbskij,* Copenhagen: Rosenkelde & Bagger.

Ruud, Charles A. (1974) "Pre-Revolutionary Russian nationalism", *CRSN* 1(2) (Spring): 276–85.

——(1982) *Fighting Words: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804–1906,* Toronto, Buffalo, New York, London: University of Toronto Press.

Sandoz, Ellis (1978) "Philosophical dimensions of Dostoevsky's politics", *JP* XL(3) (August): 648–74.

Sarkisyanz, Emanuel (1954) "Russian attitudes toward Asia", *RR* XIII(4) (October): 245–54.

——(1955) *Russland und der Messianismus des Orients: Sendungsbewusstsein und politischer Chiliasmus des Ostens,* Tubingen: Mohr.

Saunders, David B. (1982) "Historians and concepts of nationality in early nineteenth-century Russia", *SEER* LX(1) (January): 44–62.

Schapiro, Leonard B. (1961) "The role of the Jews in the Russian revolutionary movement", *SEER* XL(94) (June): 148–67.

——(1967) *Rationalism and Nationalism in Russian Nineteenth-Century Political Thought,* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Seleznyov, Iury I. (1980) *V mire Dostoevskogo,* (Liubiteliam rossiiskoi slovesnosti.) Moscow: Sovremennik.

——(1981) *Dostoevskii,* Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia.

Semyonova, Svetlana G. (1977) "Nikolai Fedorovich Fedorov (Zhizn' i ucheniia)", in *Prometei,* Vol. XI, Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia (pp. 86–105).

——(1981) "Tvorchestvo zhizni", *NS* 6:175–84 (Fyodorov).

Seton-Watson, Hugh (1967) *The Russian Empire, 1801–1917,* Oxford: Clarendon.

Shragin, Boris and Todd, Albert (1977) *Landmarks: A Collection of Essays on the Russian Intelligentsia,* New York: Karz Howard. Translation of *Vekhi.*

Sinitsyna, N.V. (1998) *Tretii Rim. Istoki i evoliutsiia russkoi srednevekovoi kontseptsii (XV-XVIVV.),* Moscow: Indrik.

Skrynnikov, Ruslan G. (1978) "On the authenticity of the Kurbskii-Groznyi correspondence: a summary of the discussion", trans. G.Edward Orchard, *SR* XXXVII(1) (March): 107–15.

——(1994) *Tretii Rim,* St Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin.

Sobel, Ruth (1981) *Gogol's Forgotten Book: Selected Passages and its Contemporary Readers,* Washington, D.C.: UP of America.

Solovyov, Aleksandr V. (1959 [1927]) *Holy Russia: The History of a Religious-Social Idea,* The Hague: Mouton (first published in Russian in Belgrade).

Solovyov, Vladimir S. (1891) *Natsianal'nyi vopros v Rossii* (Vyp. I, 3rd edn, and Vyp. II, bound in one volume), St Petersburg: Stasiulevich.

——(1896) "Messianizm", *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'* (Brockhaus-Efron), St Petersburg, XIX(150).

——(1974) *A Solovyov Anthology,* ed. and intro. Semyon L.Frank, trans. Natalie Duddington. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood (reprint of 1950 edn, London: SCM Press).

Strémooukhoff, Dimitri (1953) "Moscow the Third Rome; sources of the doctrine", *Speculum* XXVIII(1)(January): 84–101.

——(1980 [1935]) *Vladimir Soloviev and his Messianic Work,* ed. Philip Guilbeau and Heather E.MacGregor, trans. Elizabeth Meyendorff, Belmont, Mass.: Nordland (original: *Vladimir Soloviev et son oeuvre messianique,* Lausanne: L'Age d'Homme, (1975), a reprint of Strasbourg 1935 edn).

Sutton, Jonathan (1988) *The Religious Philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov: Towards a Reassessment* (Library of Philosophy and Religion), Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Szamuely, Tibor (1974) *The Russian Tradition,* ed. and intro. Robert Conquest, London: Seeker & Warburg.

Thaden, Edward C. (1964) *Conservative Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Russia,* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

——(1974) "Samarin's 'Okrainy Rossii' and Official Policy in the Baltic Provinces", *RR* XXXIII(4) (October): 405–15.

——(ed.) (1981) *Russification in the Baltic Provinces and Finland, 1855–1914,* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Tiutchev, Fyodor I. [n.d., post-1900] *PSS,* 6th edn, intro. Valery la. Briusov, St Petersburg: Marks.

——(1952) *Izbrannye stikhotvoreniia,* intro. V.V.Tiutchev, New York: Izd. im. Chekhova.

Toumanoff, Cyril (1954/5) "Moscow the Third Rome: genesis and significance of a politico-religious idea", *Catholic Historical Review* XL: 411–47.

Toynbee, Arnold J. (1948) "Russia's Byzantine heritage", in *Civilization on Trial,* London: OUP (pp. 164–83) (first published in *Horizon* XVII (August 1947): 82–95).

Trotsky, Leon (1970) *The Permanent Revolution* and *Results and Prospects,* intro. Peter Camejo, trans. John G.Wright and Brian Pearce, New York: Pathfinder.

Tsimbaev, Nikolai I. (1972) "Zapiska K.S.Aksakova 'O vnutrennem sostoianii Rossii' i ee mesto v ideologii slavianofil'stva", *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Istoriia* 2: 47–60.

——(1978) *I.S.Aksakov v obshchestvennoi zhizni poreformennoi Rossii,* Moscow: Izd. Moskovskogo universiteta.

——(1986) *Slavianofil'stvo. Iz istorii russkoi obshchestvenno-politicheskoi mysli XIX veka,* Moscow: Izd. Moskovskogo universiteta.

Ulianov, Nikolai (1969) *Zamolchannyi Marks,* Frankfurt: Possev.

Valentinov, Nikolai (1968) "O russkom messianizme", *NZh* 90:256–64.

Vekhi. Sbornik statei o russkoi intelligentsii (1967), by Nikolai A.Berdiaev, Sergei N.Bulgakov, Mikhail O.Gershenzon, Aleksandr S.Izgoev, Bogdan A.Kistiakovsky, Pyotr B.Struve and Semyon L.Frank. Frankfurt: Possev (reprint of the 2nd edn, Moscow, 1909; English: see Shragin and Todd (1977)).

Venturi, Franco (1966) *Roots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in Nineteenth Century Russia,* trans. Francis Haskell, intro. Sir Isaiah Berlin, New York: Grosset & Dunlap.

Vernadsky, George (1967) *A History of Russia* (single vol. edn), New York, Toronto, London: Bantam.

——(1969) *The Tsardom of Moscow, 1547–1682. Vol. V: A History of Russia,* New Haven, Conn, and London: Yale University Press.

Von Mohrenschildt, Dimitri (1981) *Toward a United States of Russia: Plans and Projects of Federal Reconstruction of Russia in the Nineteenth Century,* Rutherford, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press/London and Toronto: Associated University Presses.

Walicki, Andrzej (1969) *The Controversy over Capitalism: Studies in the Social Philosophy of the Russian Populists,* Oxford, New York, Toronto: Clarendon.

——(1975) *The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth Century Russian Thought,* trans. Hilda Andrews-Rusiecka, Oxford, New York, Toronto: Clarendon.

——(1980) *A History of Russian Thought: From the Enlightenment to Marxism,* trans. Hilda Andrews-Rusiecka, Oxford: Clarendon.

Walters, Philip M. (1974) "The two abysses: some reflections on ambiguous Russian attitudes to the West, with reference to S.N.Bulgakov, V.S.Solovev and F.I.Tyutchev", *Sobornost* Ser. 6(10) (Winter): 730–8.

Wiles, Peter J.D. (1965) "On physical immortality: materialism and transcendence", *Survey* 56 (July): 125–43, 57 (October): 142–61 (Fyodorov).

Williams, Robert C. (1970) "The Russian soul: a study in European thought and non-European nationalism", JHIXXXI(4) (October–December): 573–88.

Wilson, Edmund (1974) *To the Finland Station: A Study in the Writing and Acting of History,* rev. edn, n.p.: Fontana.

Wolfe, Bertram D. (1966) *Three Who Made a Revolution: A Biographical History,* Harmondsworth, Middx: Penguin (Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin).

Wolff, Robert L. (1959) "The three Romes: the migration of an ideology and the making of an autocrat", *Daedalus* LXXXVIII(2) (Spring): 291–311.

Zenkovskii, Vasily V. (1953) *Russian Thinkers and Europe,* trans. Galia S.Bodde, Ann Arbor, Mich.: Edwards.

Zernov, Nicolas (1937) *Moscow the Third Rome,* New York: Macmillan/London: SPCK.

——(1944) *Three Russian Prophets: Khomiakov, Dostoevsky, Soloviev,* 2nd edn, London: SCM.

Russia since 1917

Adomeit, Hannes (1998) "Russian national security interests", in Roy Allison and Christoph Bluth (eds) *Security Dilemmas in Russia and Eurasia,* London: RIIA (Ch. ii).

Agursky, Mikhail S. (1972) "Selling anti-Semitism in Moscow", review of lu.Ivanov, *Ostorozhno! sionizm,* trans. Peter Reddaway, *NYRB,* 16 November 1972:19–23.

——(1978) "The Soviet legitimacy crisis and its international implications", in Morton A.Kaplan (ed.) *The Many Faces of Communism,* New York: Free Press (pp. 153–66).

——(1980a) "The New Russian Literature" (Research Paper No. 40) Jerusalem: Soviet and East European Research Centre, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

——(1980b) *Ideologiia natsional-bol'shevizma* (foreword Leonard Schapiro), Paris: YMCA Press.

——(1982a) "The attitude to religion in the new Russian literature", *RCLX*(2) (Autumn): 145–55.

——(1982b) "Contemporary Russian nationalism—history revised" (Research Paper No. 45), Jerusalem: Soviet and East European Research Centre, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

——(1982c) "Suslov i russkii natsionalizm", *Posev* 6:30–3.

——(1987) *The Third Rome: National Bolshevism in the USSR,* Boulder, Colo., and Godstone, Surrey: Westview (expanded translation of Agursky's *Ideologiia natsional-bol'shevizma).*

Aksiuchits, Viktor (1995) *Ideokratiia v Rossii. Metamorfozy bogoborcheskogo rezhima,* Moscow: Vybor.

Alekseev, Mikhail N. (1972) "Seiatel' i khranitel'", *NS*9:94–111.

——(1981) "Drachuny. Roman", *NS* 6:3–98, 7:7–61, 9:27–75.

Alekseeva, A. and Golovina, Iu. (comps) (1983) *Zemlia—nosh dom*, Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia.

Alekseeva [Alexeyeva], Liudmila (1985) *Soviet Dissent: Contemporary Movements for National, Religious and Human Rights,* trans. Carol Pearce and John Glad, Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press.

Alexandrova, Vera (1964) *A History of Soviet Literature, 1917–1964,* trans. Mirra Ginsburg, Garden City, N.Y: Anchor.

Allworth, Edward (ed.) (1980) *Ethnic Russia in the USSR: The Dilemma of Dominance,* New York, Oxford and Toronto: Pergamon.

Amalrik, Andrei A. (1976) "Ideologies in Soviet Society", trans. Hilary Sternberg, *Survey* XXII(2) (Spring): 1–11.

——(1982) *Notes of a Revolutionary, trans*. Guy Daniels, intro. Susan Jacoby, New York: Knopf/London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson (original: (1982) *Zapiski dissidenta,* Ann Arbor, Mich.: Ardis).

Anderson, John (1994) *Religion, State and Society in the Soviet Union and Successor States,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Andropov, Iury V. (1983a) "Shest'desiat let SSSR. Doklad General'nogo sekretaria TsK KPSS tovarishcha Iu.V.Andropova na sovmestnom torzhestvennom zasedanii Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS, Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR i Verkhovnogo Soveta RSFSR v Kremlevskom Dvortse s"ezdov, 21 dekabria 1982 goda", *PZh* 1 (January): 3–15.

——(1983b) "Rech' General'nogo sekretaria TsK KPSS tovarishcha Iu.V.Andropova na plcnume TsK KPSS 15 iiuniia 1983 goda", *Pravda,* 16 June 1983.

Antonov, Mikhail F. (1986) "Uskorenie: vozmozhnosti i pregrady", *NS* 7:3–20.

Ashurkov, Vadim N. (1980) *Na pole Kulikovom,* 4th edn, Tula: Priokskoe knizhnoe izd.

Azrael, Jeremy R. (ed.) (1978) *Soviet Nationality Policies and Practices,* New York, London, Toronto: Praeger.

Baranov, S.T. (1973) "K kritike idei VI. Solov'eva o russkom messianstve", in Stavropol'skaia kraev. mezhvuzovskaia nauch.-teoreticheskaia konferentsiia prepodavatelei kafedr obshchestvennykh nauk, posviashchennaia 50-letiiu obrazovaniia SSSR *Materialy,* Stavropol, Pt II: 253–7.

Barghoorn, Frederick C. (1956) *Soviet Russian Nationalism,* New York: OUP.

Baron, Salo W. (1976) *The Russian Jew under Tsars and Soviets,* 2nd edn, New York: Macmillan/London: Collier Macmillan.

Beeson, Trevor (1982) *Discretion and Valour: Religious Conditions in Russia and Eastern Europe* (foreword: Sir John Lawrence), rev. edn, London: Collins/ Philadelphia: Fortress. Belotserkovsky, Vadim (comp.) (1976) *Demokraticheskie al'ternativy. Sbornik statei i dokumentov,* Achberg, FRG: Achberger Verlaganstalt.

Belotserkovsky, Vadim (1980) "The Russian nationalist opposition", trans. Susan Brownsberger, *PR* XLVII(1), 45–56.

Belov, Vasily I. (1979–81) "Lad.Ocherki o narodnoi estetike", *NS (1919)* 10:117–58, 12: 85–96; (1980) 3:60–84; (1981) 1:160–74, 5:145–71, 6:143–53, 7:125–64; also (1982) Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia.

——(1986) "Vse vperedi. Roman", NS 7:29–106, 8:59–110.

——(1989) "God velikogo pereloma. Khronika deviati mesiatsev", *NM3:*6–95.

Bely, Andrei (1966) *Stikhotvoreniia i poemy,* intro. and comp. T.Iu.Khmelnitskaia, Moscow/Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel'.

Berdiaev, Nikolai A. (1924) *Novoe srednevekov'e. Razmyshlenie o sud'be Rossii i Evropy,* Berlin: Obelisk.

——(1932) "The Religion of Communism", in Carl Schmitt, Nikolai Berdiaev and Michael de la Bedoyere (eds) *Vital Realities,* New York: Macmillan (pp. 149–89).

——(1937) *The Origin of Russian Communism.,* trans. R.M.French, London: Bles.

——(1947) *The Russian Idea,* trans. R.M.French, New York: Macmillan/London: Bles.

——(1989 [1933]) "Chelovek i mashina. (Problema sotsiologii i metafiziki tekhniki)", intro. Evgeny V.Barabanov, *VF2:*143–62 (first published (1933) *Put'* [Paris] 38 (May): 3–37.

Berelowitch, Alexis (1981) "Des Slavophiles aux russophiles", *RES* LIII(2): 233–44.

Bialer, Seweryn (1964) "How Russians rule Russia", *PC* XIII(5) (September–October): 45–52.

——(ed.) (1981) *The Domestic Context of Soviet Foreign Policy,* Boulder, Colo.: Westview/ London: Croom Helm.

Bilinsky, Yaroslav (1983) "Russian dissidents' attitudes toward the political strivings of the non-Russian nations", in symposium "Russian Dissidents and their Attitudes toward the Non-Russian Nations", NPXI(2) (Fall): 190–254 (at pp. 190–204).

Bird, Thomas E. (1973) "New interest in old Russian things: literary ferment, religious perspectives and national self-assertion", *SR* XXXII(1) (March): 17–28.

Bloch, Sidney and Reddaway, Peter (1978) *Russia's Political Hospitals: The Abuse of Psychiatry in the Soviet Union* (foreword: Vladimir K. Bukovsky), London: Futura.

Bociurkiw, Bohdan R. (1967) "Lenin and religion", in Leonard B.Schapiro and Peter Reddaway (eds) *Lenin: The Man, the Theorist, the Leader. A Reappraisal,* New York: Praeger/London: Pall Mall (pp. 107–34).

——(1973) "The shaping of Soviet religious policy", *PC*XXII(3) (May–June): 37–51. Bociurkiw, Bohdan R. and Strong, John W. (eds) (1975) *Religion and Atheism in the USSR and Eastern Europe,* London: Macmillan.

Borodin, Leonid I. (1988) "Barguzin", *LR,* 13 May 1988.

Bourdeaux, Revd Michael (1969) *Patriarch and Prophets: Persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church Today,* London: Macmillan.

Brandenburger, D.L. and Dubrovsky, A.M. (1998) "'The People Need a Tsar': the emergence of national Bolshevism as Stalinist ideology, 1931–1941", *EAS* L(5) (July): 873–92.

Brezhnev, Leonid I. (1977) "O proekte Konstitutsii (Osnovnogo Zakona) Soiuza Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik i itogakh ego vsenarodnogo obsuzhdeniia. Doklad tovarishcha L.I.Brezhneva na sessii Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR 4 oktiabria 1977 goda", *Kommunist* 15 (October): 7–19.

——(1981) "Otchet Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS XXVI s"ezdu Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza i ocherednye zadachi partii v oblasti vnutrennei i vneshnei politiki. Doklad General'nogo sekretaria TsK KPSS tovarishcha L.I.Brezhneva 23 fevralia 1981 goda", *W* 25 February 1981.

Bristol, Evelyn (ed.) (1982) *Russian Literature and Criticism: Selected Papers from the Second World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies,* Berkeley: Berkeley Slavic Specialities.

Broun, J.A. (1974) "Russia's Don Quixote", *New Blackfriars,* LV(649) (June): 272–79 (Levitin-Krasnov).

Brown, Archie (1996) *The Gorbachev Factor,* Oxford: OUP

Brown, Archie and Kaser, Michael (eds) (1978) *The Soviet Union since the Fall of Khrushchev,* 2nd edn, London: Macmillan.

Brown, Deming (1978) *Soviet Russian Literature since Stalin,* London and New York: Cambridge University Press.

——(1993) *The Last Years of Soviet Russian Literature: Prose Fiction 1975–1991,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bukovsky, Vladimir K. (1978) *To Build a Castle: My Life as a Dissenter,* trans. Michael Scammell, London: Andre Deutsch.

Byzov, Leonty G. and Lvov, Nikolai V (1989) "Perestroika: politicheskoe soznanie i sotsial'nye otnosheniia", *Vek XX i mir* 3:10–18.

Carter, Stephen (1977) *The Politics of Solzhenitsyn,* London: Macmillan.

——(1990) *Russian Nationalism: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow,* London: Pinter.

Chalmaev, Viktor A. (1963) "'Sviatye' i 'besy'", *Oktiabr'* 10:215–17.

——(1968a) "Velikie iskanii", *MG* 3:270–95.

——(1968b) "Neizbezhnost"', *MG* 9:259–89.

——(1978) "Otbleski plameni. Voenno-patrioticheskaia tema: traditsii, dostizheniia, poiski", *Moskva* 2:182–91.
Chapman, Malcolm C. (1979) "The 1969 Soviet Symposium on the Slavophiles", *SST* XX (1) (July): 23–42.
Chernenko, Konstantin U. (1982) "Shest'desiat let bratskoi druzhby narodov", *PMiS* 12: 6–14.
——(1983) "Aktual'nye voprosy ideologicheskoi, massovo-politicheskoi raboty partii", *Pravda,* 15 June 1983.
——(1984) "Vystuplenie tovarishcha K.U.Chernenko na zasedanii TsK KPSS po podgotovke novoi redaktsii Programmy KPSS", *Kommunist* 7 (May): 4–8.
Chinn, Jeff and Kaiser, Robert (1996) *Russians as the New Minority: Ethnicity and Nationalism in the Soviet Successor States,* Boulder, Colo. and Oxford: Westview.
Chuev, Feliks (1968) "Kogda-nibud'—ia znaiu—eto budet…" *MG* 12:212.
Connor, Walker (1984) *The National Question in Marxist-Leninist Theory and Strategy,* Princeton, N.J. and Guildford: Princeton University Press.
Conquest, Robert (ed.) (1986) *The Last Empire: Nationality and the Soviet Future,* Stanford: Hoover Institution Press.
Corley, Felix (1996) *Religion in the Soviet Union: An Archival Reader,* Basingstoke: Macmillan.
Cosgrove, Simon Anthony (1998) *"Nash sovremennik* 1981–1991: a case study in the politics of Soviet literature with special reference to Russian nationalism", PhD thesis, SSEES, University of London.
Davies, R.W. (1997) *Soviet History in the Yeltsin Era,* Basingstoke: Macmillan/CREES.
Dawisha, Karen and Parrott, Bruce (eds) (1997) *The End of Empire: The Transformation of the USSR in Comparative Perspective* (International Politics of Eurasia, Vol. IX), Armonk, N.Y. and London: Sharpe.
Dementev, Aleksandr G. (1969) "O traditsiiakh i narodnosti (Literaturnye zametki)", *NM* 4:215–35.
Denber, Rachel (ed.) (1992) *The Soviet Nationality Reader: The Disintegration in Context,* Boulder, Colo., and Oxford: Westview.
Deutscher, Isaac (1954) *The Prophet Armed: Trotsky, 1879–1921,* London: OUR
——(1959) *The Prophet Unarmed: Trotsky, 1921–1929,* London: OUP.
——(1963) *The Prophet Outcast: Trotsky, 1929–1940,* London: OUP.
——(1966) *Stalin: A Political Biography,* rev. edn, Harmondsworth, Middx: Penguin.
Dixon, Simon (1996) "The Russians and the Russian question", in Graham Smith (ed.) *The Nationalities Question in the Post-Soviet States,* Harlow, Essex and New York: Longman (Ch. iii).
Donzov, Dmytro (1961) "Who were the spiritual fathers of the October Revolution? (Or, the Russians about themselves)", *Ukrainian Review* VII(3) (Autumn), 17–25.
Dorosh, Efim (1961) "Sukhoe leto. 1960", *NM* 7:3–51 (village prose).
——(1962) "Raigorod v fevrale", *NM* 10:9–46 (village prose).
Drobyshev, Vladimir (1969) "Bessmerten, kak vremia", *MG* 12:277–8.
Dudko, Fr Dimitry S. (1980) "Otkrytoe pis'mo Ego Sviateishestvu, Sviateishemu Patriarkhu Moskovskomu i vseia Rusi Pimenu", *ZhMP 7* (5 June 1980): 40.
Duncan, Peter J.S. (1979) "Ivanov-Razumnik and the Russian Revolution: from 'Scythianism' to suffocation", CSPXXI(1) (March): 15–27.
——(1988a) "The Fate of Russian Nationalism: The Samizdat Journal *Veche* Revisited", *RCL* XVI(1) (Spring): 36–53.

——(1988b) "Ideology and the National Question: Marxism-Leninism and the Nationality Policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union", in Stephen White and Alex Pravda (eds) *Ideology and Soviet Politics* (Studies in Russia and East Europe), London: Macmillan/SSEES (pp. 180–202).

——(1988c) "The Party and Russian nationalism", in Peter J.Potichnyj (ed.) *The Soviet Union: Party and Society* (Selected Papers from the Third World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies, Washington, DC, 30 October-4 November 1985), sponsored by the International Committee for Soviet and East European Studies and the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press (pp. 229–45).

(1989) "Russian Messianism: a historical and political analysis", PhD thesis, University of Glasgow. Dunlop, John B. (1976a) "Iz-pod glyb", SSXXVIII(4) (October): 621–8.

——(1976b) *The New Russian Revolutionaries,* Belmont, Mass.: Woodland (VSKhSON).

——(1979a) "The many faces of contemporary Russian nationalism", *Survey* XXIV(3) (Summer): 18–35.

——(1979b) Review of A.Ianov, *The Russian New Right,* and J.Stephan, *The Russian Fascists,* in SSXXXI(4) (October): 608–10.

——(1981) "Important points missed", *SR* XL(3) (Fall), 457–60 (Solzhenitsyn). This article provoked Ianov's letter to *SR,* Spring 1982.

——(1982) Letter replying to Ianov, *SR* XLI(1) (Spring), 198–9.

——(1983a) *"Mnogaya leta:* advocate of a Russian Church—Soviet State concordat", *RCL* XI(2) (Summer), 146–60.

——(1983b) *The Faces of Contemporary Russian Nationalism,* Princeton, N.J., and Guildford: Princeton University Press.

——(1985) *The New Russian Nationalism* (foreword: Robert F.Byrnes), (The Washington Papers 116), New York, Eastbourne, Toronto: Praeger with the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

——(1995) *The Rise of Russia and the Fall of the Soviet Empire,* new edn, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

——(1997) "Russia: in search of an identity?" in Ian Bremmer and Ray Terras (eds) *New States, New Politics: Building the Post-Soviet Nations,* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press (Ch. ii).

——(1998) *Russia Confronts Chechnya: Roots of a Separatist Conflict,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dunn, Dennis J. (1977) "Religious Renaissance in the USSR", *Journal of Church and State* XIX(1) (Winter): 21–36.

Elletson, Harold (1998) *The General against the Kremlin. Alexander Lebed: Power and Illusion,* London: Little, Brown.

Ellis, Jane (1980a) "USSR: the Christian seminar", *RCLVlll(2)* (Summer): 92–112.

——(1980b) "The Christian Committee for the Defence of Believers' Rights in the USSR", *RCL* VIII(4) (Winter): 279–98.

——(1986)*The Russian Orthodox Church: A Contemporary History,* London: Croom Helm.

——(1996) *The Russian Orthodox Church: Triumphalism and Defensiveness,* Basingstoke: Macmillan/St Antony's.

Ericson, Edward E., Jr. (1993) *Solzhenitsyn and the Modern World,* Washington, D.C.: Regnery Gateway.

Evtushenko, Evgeny A. (1985) "Iagodnye mesta. Roman" (intro. Valentin G.Rasputin), English: *Wild Berries,* trans. Antonina W.Bouis, London: Black Swan. (First published (1981): *Moskva* 10:3–123, 11:52–111.)

Fedoseev, Pyotr N. (1980) "Teoreticheskie problemy razvitiia i sblizheniia natsii", *Kommunist* 1 (January): 57–70.

Feldbrugge, E.J.M. (ed.) (1975) *Samizdat and Political Dissent in the Soviet Union,* Leyden: A.W Sijthoff.

Fireside, Harvey (1971) *Icon and Swastika: The Russian Orthodox Church under Nazi and Soviet Control,* foreword: Paul B.Anderson, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Fletcher, William C. (1973) *Religion and Soviet Foreign Policy, 1945–1970,* London and New York: OUP for the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

Frankel, Edith Rogovin (1981) *Novy Mir: A Case Study in the Politics of Literature, 1952–1958,* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

——(1982) "The Tvardovsky controversy", *SS*XXXIV(4) (October): 601–15.

Frankel, Jonathan (1972) "The anti-Zionist press campaigns in the USSR 1969–1971: An Internal Dialogue?" *SJA* 3 (May): 3–26.

Frasure, Robert C. (1974) "Historic preservation policy in the USSR", *CSP* XVI(3) (Autumn): 371–8.

Frazer, George and Lancelle, George. (1994) *Zhirinovsky: The Little Black Book: Making Sense of the Senseless,* London, New York, Toronto: Penguin.

Freeborn, Richard, Milner-Gulland, Robin R. and Ward, Charles A. (eds) (1976) *Russian and Slavic Literature,* Cambridge, Mass.: Slavica.

Frumkin, Iakov G., Aronson, Gregor la. and Goldenweiser, Aleksei A. (eds) (1968) *Kniga o russkom evreistve, 1917–1967,* New York: Association of Russian Jews.

Fülöp-Miller, Rene. (1927) *The Mind and Face of Bolshevism: An Examination of Cultural Life in Soviet Russia,* trans. F.S.Flint and D.F.Tait, London and New York: Putnam.

Furov, V. (1979 [1975]) "Iz otcheta Soveta po delam religii chlenam TsK KPSS. Tserkovnye kadry i mery po ogranicheniiu ikh deiatel'nosti ramkami zakona" , *Vestnik* 130:275–344.

Galin, O. (1977) "'Misteriia X**X** **v**eka'", *Posev* 8:54–7 (Glazunov).

Gallai, Mark (1966) "Pervyi boi my vyigrali. Iz zapisok letchika ispytatelia", NM 9:3–50 (Soviet Jew recalls Nazi-Soviet Pact).

Gillespie, David C. (1986) *Valentin Rasputin and Soviet Russian Village Prose,* London: Modern Humanities Research Association.

Glazunov, Ilia S. (1965/6) "Doroga k tebe. Iz zapisok khudozhnika", *MG* (1965) 10: 91–142, 12:191–242; (1966) 2:171–92, 225–41, 6:236–71.

——(1978) *Il'ia Glazunov,* Photo-album, Moscow: Planeta.

Golomshtok, Igor N. "Fenomen Glazunova", *Sintaksis:* 4 (1979): 119–38.

Gorbachev, Mikhail S. (1986) "Politicheskii doklad Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS XXVII s"ezdu Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza. Doklad General'nogo sekretaria TsK KPSS tovarishcha Gorbacheva M.S. 25 February 1986", *Pravda,* 26 February 1986.

Grigorenko, Pyotr [Petro] G. (1983) *Memoirs,* trans. Thomas P.Whitney, London: Harvill.

Guralnik, U. and Dmitrenko, S. (1982) "'God Dostoevskogo'. (Po stranitsam literaturnykh zhurnalov)", *VL* 5:191–216.

Hajda, Lubomyr and Beissinger, Mark (eds) (1990) *The Nationalities Factor in Soviet Politics and Society* (John M.Olin Critical Issues Series), Boulder, Colo., and Oxford: Westview.

Halperin, Charles J. (1984) "The six-hundredth anniversary of the battle of Kulikovo Field, 1380–1980, in Soviet historiography", *CASS* XVIII(3) (Fall): 298–310.

Hammer, Darrell P. (1982) "Russian Nationalism and the 'Yanov Thesis'", *RCL* X(3) (Winter): 310–16.

——(1984) "Vladimir Osipov and the Veche Group (1971–1974): a page from the history of political dissent", *RR* XLIII(4) (October): 355–75.

Haney, Jack V. (1973) "The revival of interest in the Russian past in the Soviet Union", *SR* XXXII(1) (March): 1–16, and "Reply", *ibid.:* 41–4.

Hauner, Milan (1990) *What is Asia to Us? Russia's Asian Heartland Yesterday and Today,* foreword: Paul M.Kennedy, Winchester, Mass., and London: Unwin Hyman.

Heller, Michael (1975) "Survivors from Utopia", *Survey,* XXI(3) (Summer): 155–66 *(Iz-podglyb).*

Hirszowicz, Lukasz (1979) "Soviet perceptions of Zionism", *SJA* IX(1):53–65.

Hodnett, Grey (1967) "The debate over Soviet federalism", SSXVIII(4) (April): 458–81.

Hosking, Geoffrey A. (1973) "The Russian Peasant rediscovered: 'Village Prose' of the 1960s", SRXXXII(4) (December): 705–24.

——(1975) "Vasilii Belov—chronicler of the Russian village", *RR* XXXIV(2) (April): 165–85.

——(1980) *Beyond Socialist Realism: Soviet Fiction since "Ivan Denisovich",* London, Toronto, New York: Granada.

——(1989) "The institutionalization of Soviet literature", in Geoffrey A.Hosking and George Cushing (eds) *Perspectives on Literature and Society in Eastern and Western Europe,* Basingstoke: Macmillan/SSEES (Ch. iv).

——(1991a) *The Awakening of the Soviet Union,* 2nd edn, London: Mandarin.

——(ed.) (1991b) *Church, Nation and State in Russia and Ukraine* (Studies in Russia and East Europe), Basingstoke: Macmillan/SSEES.

Hosking, Geoffrey A., Aves, Jonathan and Duncan, Peter J.S. (1992) *The Road to Post-Communism: Independent Political Movements in the Soviet Union, 1985–1991,* London: Pinter.

Hosking, Geoffrey and Service, Robert (eds) (1998) *Russian Nationalism: Past and Present* (Studies in Russia and East Europe), Basingstoke: Macmillan/SSEES.

——(eds) (1999) *Reinterpreting Russia,* London: Arnold.

Hughes, Michael (1993) "The never-ending story: Russian nationalism, national Communism and opposition to reform in the USSR and Russia", *JCS* IX(2) (June): 41–61.

Hyams, Neil (1986) "Russian nationalism", in George Schöpflin (ed.) *The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe: A Handbook,* 2nd edn, London: Muller, Blond & White/New York: Facts on File (pp. 232–43).

Iakovlev, Aleksandr N. (1972) "Protiv antiistorizma", *LG,* 15 November 1972.

Ianov, Aleksandr L. (Alexander Yanov) (1977a) *Detente after Brezhnev: The Domestic Roots of Soviet Foreign Policy* (Policy Papers in International Affairs: 2), trans. Robert Kessler, foreword: George W.Breslauer, Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California.

——(1977b) "The fate of the Russian idea", trans. Marian Schwartz, *SST* XVII(4) (December): 289–308.

——(1978a) *The Russian new Right: right-wing ideologies in the contemporary USSR,* trans. Stephen P.Dunn, Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California.

——(1978b) "Ideal'noe gosudarstvo Gennadiia Shimanova", *Sintaksis* 1:31–56.

——(1982) Letter on Dunlop, *SR* XLI(1) (Spring): 196–8.

——(1987) *The Russian Challenge and the Year 2000,* trans. Iden J.Rosenthal, Oxford: Blackwell.

Ingram, Alan (1999) "'A Nation Split into Fragments': The Congress of Russian Communities and Russian Nationalist Ideology", *EAS LI* (4) (June): 687–704.

Institute of Jewish Affairs (1978) *Soviet Antisemitic Propaganda: Evidence from Books, Press and Radio,* London: IJA.

Iovchuk, M. (1971) "Sovremennye problemy ideologicheskoi bor'by", *Kommunist* 15 (October), 92–112.

Iuvenaly, Metropolitan (1975) "Statement by Metropolitan Yuvenaly", *RCL* 111(1–3) (January–June): 24–5.

Ivanov, Iury D. (1969) "Ekho russkogo naroda", *MG6:*286–94.

Ivanov, Col. O. (retd) (1985) "Geroicheskoe proshloe nashei Rodiny", *KVS* 11:72–8.

Ivanov, V. (1970) "Sotsializm i kul'turnoe nasledie", *Kommunist* 17 (November): 89–100.

Jones, Ellen, and Grupp, Fred W. (1984) "Modernisation and ethnic equalisation in the USSR", *SS,* XXXVI(2) (April): 159–84.

"K 600-letiiu pobedy na Kulikovom pole", ZhMP(1980) 12:6–27.

Kaiser, Robert (1994) *The Geography of Nationalism in Russia and the USSR,* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Kargalov, V.V. (1980) "Moskva i Kulikovskaia bitva", *Moskva* 8:187–200.

——(1981) "'Preemstvennost', Review of F.Nesterov, *Sviaz' vremen", NS* 1*:*187–91.

Karklins, Rasma (1986) *Ethnic Relations in the USSR: The Perspective from Below,* Boston, Mass., and London: Allen & Unwin.

Kelley, Donald R. (1982) *The Solzhenitsyn-Sakharov Dialogue: Politics, Society and the Future,* Westport, Conn., and London: Greenwood.

Khariuzov, Archpriest N.A. (1947) "Moskva", *ZhMP* 1:25–6.

Kheifets, Mikhail (1981) "Russkii patriot Vladimir Osipov", *Kontinent* 27:159–214, 28: 134–79.

——(1985) 'Anti-Semitism of the Adherents of State Nationalism' (based on books published in the series ZH. Z.L. in the late 1970s and early 1980s)", *Jews and Jewish Topics in Soviet and East-European Publications,* Bulletin of the Centre for Research of East-European Jewry, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, September: 4–14.

Khovansky, Sergei (1986) "Afghanistan: the bleeding wound", *Detente* 6 (Spring): 2–4.

Kirpichnikov, Anatoly N. (1980) *Kulikovskaia bitva,* AN SSSR. Institut arkheologii. Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoe otdelenie.

Kiselev, Aleksandr (1980) "Chto proizoshlo s ottsom Dmitriem?" *RV* 10*:*66.

Kline, George L. (1973) "Religion, national character and the 'rediscovery of Russian roots'", *SR,* XXXII(1) (March): 29–40.

Knight, Amy W. (1990) *The KGB: Police and Politics in the Soviet Union,* rev. edn, Boston, Mass., and London: Unwin Hyman.

Kochan, Lionel (ed.) (1978) *The Jews in Soviet Russia since 1917,* 3rd edn, London: OUP

Kohn, Hans (1948) "The permanent mission: an essay on Russia", *RPX(3)* (July), 267–89.

——(1960) *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology,* 2nd edn, rev., New York: Viking.
Kolarz, Walter (1944) *Stalin and Eternal Russia,* London: Lindsay Drummond.
——(1956) *Russia and her Colonies,* 3rd edn, London: Philip.
——(1961) *Religion in the Soviet Union,* London: Macmillan.
Kollektivnyi korrespondent *Kommunista*—zhurnal *Chelovek i zakon,* (1978) "Predmet bol'shogo patrioticheskogo vnimaniia", *Kommunist* 11 (July): 53–66.
Kolstoe, Paul (1995) *Russians in the Former Soviet Republics,* London: Hurst.
Kommunist 8 (May 1982):128 (against Soloukhin).
Konstitutsiia Rossiiskoi Federatsii. Proekt, Moscow: Iuridicheskaia literatura, 1993.
Korey, William (1973) *The Soviet Cage: Anti-Semitism in Russia,* New York: Viking.
——(1995) *Russian Antisemitism, Pamyat and the Demonology of £ionism, C*hur: Harwood.
Kosolapov, Richard I. (1982) "Klassovye i natsional'nye otnosheniia na etape razvitogo sotsializma", *SI* 4 (October–December): 8–21.
Kozhevnikov, F.I. (1950) "Russkaia diplomatiia XIX veka v otsenke Engel'sa", *SGiP* 12: 18–34.
Kozhinov, Vadim V. (1969) "Trizhdy veiikaia", *MG* 12:279–83.
——(1981) "'I nazovet menia vsiak sushchii v nei iazyk…' Zametki o svoeobrazii russkoi literatury", *NS* 11:155–76.
——(1988) "Pravda i istina", *NS* 4:160–75 (on Anatoly Rybakov's *Deti Arbata*).
——(1989) "'Samaia bol'shaia opasnost'…'", *NS* 1:141–79.
Krasikov, Oleg(1981) "Pole Kulikovo", *Veche* (Munich) 1:51–65. Kreindler, Isabelle (1982) "The changing status of Russian in the Soviet Union", *IJSL* 33 (special issue): 7–39.
Kuleshov, Vasily I. "Tochnost' kritiriev", *Pravda,* 1 February 1982. Soviet attitudes to Dostoevsky.
Kulichenko, Mikhail I. (1972) *Natsional'nye otnosheniia v SSSR i tendentsii ikh razvitiia,* Moscow: Mysl'.
——(1976) *Ukreplenie internatsional'nogo edinstva sovetskogo obshchestva,* Kiev: Politizdat Ukrainy.
——(ed.) (1981a) *Aktual'nye problemy natsional'nykh otnoshenii v svete konstitutsii SSSR,* Moscow: Nauka.
——(1981 b) *Rastsvet i sbtizhenie natsii v SSSR. Problemy teorii i metodologii, Mos*cow: Mysl'.
——(1984) *Nations and Social Progress,* trans. Galia Glagoleva, Moscow: Progress. *Kulikovskaia bitva. Sbornik statei,* AN SSSR. Institut istorii SSSR, Moscow: Nauka, 1982. *Kulikovskaia bitva v istorii i kul'ture nashei Rodiny. Pamiatniki iubileinoi nauchnoi konferentsii,* Moscow: Izd. Moskovskogo universiteta, 1983.
"Kul'turno-dukhovnoe dvizhenie v Leningrade", *Posev* (1977) 3:9–11.
Kuprin, Vladimir (comp.) (1980) *Mezh Nepriadvoi i Donom (K 600-letiiu Kulikovskoi bitvy),* Moscow: Sovremennik.
Kuvakin, Valery A. (1980) *Religioznaia filosofiia v Rossii nachalo XX veka,* Moscow: Mysl'.
Kuznetsov, Iury P. (1983) *Russkii uzel. Stikhotvoreniia ipoemy,* Moscow: Sovremennik.
Labedz, Leopold (1972) "The destiny of writers in revolutionary movements", *Survey,* XVIII(1) (Winter), 8–46.
——(ed. and intro) (1974) *Solzhenitsyn: A Documentary Record,* 2nd edn, Harmondsworth, Middx: Penguin.

Lakshin, Vladimir la. (1980) *Solzhenitsyn, Tvardovsky and Novy Mir,* trans. and ed. Michael Glenny, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT (original in *Dvadtsatyi' vek* (London 1977) 2:151–218).

Lane, Christel (1978) *Christian Religion in the Soviet Union: A Sociological Study,* London and Boston, Mass.: Allen & Unwin.

Lanshchikov, Anatoly P. (1969) "Ostorozhno—kontseptsiia! Polemicheskie zametki", *MG* 2:275–97.

Lapidus, Gail W. and Zaslavsky, Victor (eds) with Philip Goldman (1992) *From Union to Commonwealth: Nationalism and Separatism in the Soviet Republics,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laqueur, Walter (1993) *Black Hundred: The Rise of the Extreme Right in Russia,* New York: HarperCollins.

Lebed, Aleksandr I. (1995) *Za Derzhavy obidno…* Kirov: Viatskoe slovo.

Lenin, Vladimir I. (1958–65) *PSS,* 5th edn (55 vols), Moscow: Politizdat.

"Leningradskie protsessy", *Posev* (1968) 1:9–11. VSKhSON.

Levitin-Krasnov, Anatoly E. (1975) "Otets Dimitrii Dudko" (Frankfurt, December 1974), *Posev* 1:26–36.

——(1979) "Religion and Soviet youth", *RCL* VII(4) (Winter): 232–37.

——(1980a) "O tekh, kogo nedavno sudili", *Posev* 11:45–7 (Dudko).

——(1980b) *Vospominaniia. Pt III: V poishakh novogo grada,* Tel Aviv: Krug.

——(1981) *Vospominaniia. Pt IV: Rodnoi prostor. Demokraticheskoe dvizhenie,* Frankfurt: Possev.

Lewin, Moshe (1975) *Lenin's Last Struggle,* London: Pluto.

Lewis, Philippa (1976) "Peasant nostalgia in contemporary Russian literature", *SS* XXVIII 4 (October): 548–69. Lieven, Anatol (1998) *Chechnya: Tombstone of Russian Power,* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

——(1999) "The weakness of Russian nationalism", *Suruival* XLI. 2 (Summer): 53–70.

Likhachev, Dmitry S. (gen. ed.) (1980) *Arkhitekturno-khudozhestvenhye pamiatniki Solovetskikh ostrovov,* Moscow: Iskusstvo.

——(1980) "Zametki o russkom", *NM* 3:10–38 (also book of same title (1984), 2nd edn, Moscow: Sovetskaia Rossia.

——(1991) *Reflections on Russia* (CCRS Series on Change in Contemporary Soviet Society), ed. Nicolai N.Petrov, trans. Christina Sever, foreword: S.Frederick Starr, Boulder, Colo., and Oxford: Westview.

Likhachev, Dmitry S. and Ianin, V. (1986) "Russkii Sever kak pamiatnik otechestvennoi i mirovoi kul'tury", *Kommunist* 1 (January): 115–19.

"Literaturnaia kritika rannikh slavianofilov", *VL*(1969) 5:90–135, 7:116–52, 10:103–44, 12:73–140 (listed under author in previous section).

Litvinoff, Emanuel (ed.) (1974) *Soviet Anti-Semitism: The Paris Trial,* foreword: Valery Panov, London: Wildwood House.

Lobanov, Mikhail P. (1968) "Prosveshchennoe meshchanstvo", *MG* 4:294–306.

——(1981) "Naiti v cheloveke cheloveka", *Oktiabr'*8:206–210.

——(1982) "Osvobozhdenie (O romane M. Alekseeva *Drachuny*)", *Volga* 10:145–64.

——(1988) "Posleslovie. Iz vospominanii", NS 4:154–59 (*Molodaia gvardiia* in 1960s–1970s).

Loshchits, Iury M. (1980) *Dmitrii Donskoi* (Zhizn' zamechatel'nykh liudei), Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia.

Low, Alfred D. (1958) *Lenin on the Question of Nationality,* New York: Bookman.

Lukin, lu.A. (1984) "Slushaia pul's vremeni. (Zakonomernosti iskusstva i dialektika khudozhestvennogo poznaniia)", *VL* 7:3–35.
Lury, Iury (1975) "Na protsesse VSKhSON", *Nzh* 119 (June): 119–29.
——(1979) "Letter to the Editor", *Survey* XXIV(1) (Winter): 213–15 (VSKhSON).
McCauley, Martin and Sagramoso, Domitilla (1994) "Russian Federation", in Bohdan Szajkowski (ed.) *Political Parties in Eastern Europe, Russia and the Successor States,* Harlow, Essex: Longman.
McDaniel, Tim (1996) *The Agony of the Russian Idea,* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
Malcolm, Neil, Pravda, Alex, Allison, Roy and Light, Margot (1996) *Internal Factors in Russian Foreign Policy,* Oxford: OUP/RIIA.
Manukian, G. (1974) "Obyknovennyi sionizm", *NS* 3:187–89.
Maryniak, Irena (1989) *"Samizdat* Today: A Review", *RCL* XVII(2) (Summer): 123–4.
Masing-Delic, Irene (1981) "Zhivago as Fedorovian soldier", *RR* XL(3) (July), 300–16.
Medvedev, Roy A. (1980) *On Soviet Dissent: Interviews with Piero Ostellino,* ed. George Saunders, trans. William A.Packer, New York: Columbia University Press/London: Constable.
Medvedev, Zhores A. (1983) *Andropov,* Oxford: Blackwell.
——(1986) *Gorbachev,* Oxford: Blackwell.
Meerson-Aksyonov, Mikhail [Michael Aksenov Meerson] (1981) "The Russian Orthodox Church, 1965–1980", *RCLIX*(3–4) (Autumn): 101–10.
Melvin, Neil (1995) *Russians beyond Russia: The Politics of National Identity,* London: Pinter/RIIA.
Mikulinsky, S.R. (1982) "Tak li nado otnosit'sia k nasledstvu?" *VF*12:151–7 (Fyodorov).
Mit'kin, N. (1969) "V bor'be protiv trotskizma", Review of *Bor'ba partii bol'shevikov protiv trotskizma v posleoktiabr'skii period, MG* 10:289–96.
Monas, Sidney (1981) "GULag and Points West", *SR* XL(3) (Fall): 444–56 (with reply to Dunlop: 461–63).
"My—sovetskii narod", *Kommunist* 12 (August 1982): 3–12.
Motyl, Alexander J. (ed.) (1992a) *The Post-Soviet Nations: Perspectives on the Demise of the USSR* (Studies of Harriman Institute, Columbia University), New York and Oxford: Columbia University Press.
——(1992b) *Thinking Theoretically about Soviet Nationalities: History and Comparison in the Study of the USSR* (Studies of the Harriman Institute, Columbia University.) New York: Columbia University Press.
Na pole Kulikovom. Rasskazy russtikh letopisei i voinskie povesti xiii-xv vekov, Comp. Aleksei Shmarinov, Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1980.
Nahaylo, Bohdan and Swoboda, Victor (1990) *Soviet Disunion: A History of the Nationalities Problem in the USSR,* London, New York and Markham, Ont: Hamish Hamilton/Penguin.
Nechkina, Militsa V. (1951) "K voprosu o formule 'naimen'shee zlo'. (Pis'mo v redaktsiiu)", *VI* 4:44–8.
Nesterov, Fyodor F. (1984 [1980]) *Sviaz' vremen, Opyt istoricheskoi publitsistiki,* 2nd edn, Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia.
Neumann, Iver B. (1996) *Russia and the Idea of Europe,* London: Routledge.
Nielsen, Niels C. (ed.) (1994) *Christianity after Communism: Social, Political and Cultural Struggle in Russia,* Boulder, Colo., and Oxford: Westview.
"Novyi prigovor Vladimiru Osipovu", *Posev* (1975) 10:12.

Olcott, Martha Brill (1985) "Yuri Andropov and the 'national question'", *SS,* XXXVII: 1 (January): 103–17.

Palmer, S.T. (1970) "The restoration of ancient monuments in the USSR", *Survey* 74–5 (Spring): 163–74.

Pamiatniki otechestva, published for Vserossiiskoe obshchestvo okhrany pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury: No. 1 (1972); No. 2 (1975); No. 3 (1977); No. 4 (1979); from 1980, two issues per year, referred to as Nos. 1 and 2, Moscow: Sovetskaia Rossiia.

Paramonov, Boris (1979) "Paradoksy i kompleksy Aleksandra Ianova", *Kontinent.* 20: 231–73.

Parland, Thomas (1993) *The Rejection in Russia of Totalitarian Socialism and Liberal Democracy: A Study of the Russian New Right* (Commentationes Scientiarum Socialium 46), Helsinki: Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters.

Parthé, Kathleen F. (1992) *Russian Village Prose: The Radiant Past,* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Pavlenko, Nikolai I. (1975) *Petr Pervyi* (Zhizn' zamechatel'nykh liudei), Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia.

Pavlov, Vladimir N. (1971) "Spory o slavianofil'stve i russkom patriotizme v sovetskoi nauchnoi literature 1967–1970 gg.", Grani: 82 (December): 183–211.

"Pered ser'eznym razgovorom", *MG* (1967) 6:317–18 (a *Molodaia gvardiia* manifesto).

Petro, Nicolai N. (1987) "'The Project of the Century': a case study of Russian national dissent", SCC XX(3–4) (Autumn-Winter), 235–52.

——(ed.) (1991) *Christianity and Russian Culture in Soviet Society* (CCRS Series on Change in Contemporary Soviet Society), Boulder, Colo. and London: Westview.

Petropavlovsky, R. (1983) "'Po povodu odnoi knigi', On Iu.Davydov, *Etika liubvi i metafizika svoevoliia", Kommunist* 8 (May): 102–14.

Pikul, Valentin S. (1979) "U poslednei cherty", *MS* 4:19–152, 5:62–145, 6:79–120, 7: 34–127.

Pipes, Richard (1964) *The Formation of the Soviet Union: Communism and Nationalism, 1917–1923,* rev. edn, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Pres.

Pitirim, Archbishop of Volokolamsk (ed.) (1982) *The Orthodox Church in Russia,* trans. Michael M.Wolyniec, London: Thames and Hudson.

Pittman, Riita H. (1992) "Writers and politics in the Gorbachev era", *SS* XLIV(4): 665–85.

Plyushch, Leonid I. (1979) *History's Carnival: A Dissident's Autobiography,* with a contribution by Tatiana Plyushch, ed. and trans. Marco Carynnyk, London: Collins and Harvill/New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

"Pochta zhurnala: iiul'-dekabr' 1981 goda", *Kommunist* 2 (January 1982): 127–8. Soloukhin.

Pole Kulikovo. Skazaniia o bitve na Donu, ed. L.A.Dimitriev, intro. Dmitry S.Likhachev, Moscow: Sovetskaia Rossiia, 1980.

"Pole russkoi slavy", *Moskva* (1980) 10, centre (pictures about Kulikovo).

Polowy, Teresa (1989) *The Novellas of Valentin Rasputin: Genre, Language and Style,* New York: Peter Lang.

Ponomaryov, Boris N. (1982) "Leninskaia natsional'naia politika KPSS i ee mezhdunarodnoe znachenie", *PMiS9:*3–9.

Porter, Robert (1986) "The Mother Theme in Valentin Rasputin", *CSP* XXVIII(3) (September): 287–303.

——(1989) *Four Contemporary Russian Writers,* Oxford and New York: Berg (Rasputin, Aitmatov, Voinovich and Vladimov).

Pospielovsky, Dimitry V. (1971) "The Samizdat Journal 'Veche': Russian Patriotic Thought Today",Radio Liberty CRD 331/71 (5 November 1971).

——(1973) "The resurgence of Russian nationalism in *Samizdat", Survey* XIX(1) (Winter): 51–74.

——(1975a) "Vol'nye mysli o sbornike *Iz-podglyb", Grani* 97 (July–September): 174–222.

——(1975b) "More on historic preservation policy in the USSR", *CSP* XVII(4) (Winter): 641–9.

——(1978) "Russkii natsionalizm v segodniashnei istoricheskoi obstanovke", *Posev* 12: 10–15.

——(1979) "A comparative enquiry into neo-Slavophilism and its antecedents in the Russian history of ideas", *SS* XXXI(3) (July): 319–42.

——(1984) *The Russian Church and the Soviet Regime, 1917–1982,* 2 vols., New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

——(1987) *A History of Soviet Atheism in Theory and Practice, and the Believer. Vol. I: A History of Marxist-Leninist Atheism and Soviet Antireligious Policies,* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

——(1988) *A History of Soviet Atheism in Theory and Practice, and the Believer. Vol. II: Soviet Antireligious Campaigns and Persecutions,* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

——(1989) *A History of Soviet Atheism in Theory and Practice, and the Believer. Vol. III: Soviet Studies on the Church and the Believer's Response to Atheism,* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Powell, David E. (1978) *Antireligious Propaganda in the Soviet Union: A Study of Mass Persuasion,* Cambridge, Mass., and London: MIT.

Preobrazhensky, A., and Kurmacheva, M. (1982) "'Istoriia i publitsistika', review of F. Nesterov, *Sviaz' vremen",* NM 1:263–5.

Pribylovsky, Vladimir (1994) "Survey of radical right-wing groups in Russia", *RFE/RL Research Report* III(16) (22 April): 28–37.

Prizel, Ilya (1998) *National Identity and Foreign Policy: Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia and Ukraine,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Prokhanov, Aleksandr (1985) "Zapiski na brone", *LG,* 28 August 1985. English: *The Guardian,* 28 September 1985.

——(1986) "'Formuly, gipotezy', *LG,* 6 November 1985", excerpt trans. Ruth Sobell, *Detente:* 6 (Spring): 16–18.

Protchenko, V.I. (1977) "Sovremennaia 'derevenskaia proza' v literaturnoi kritike. (Real'nye dostizheniia i spornye otsenki)", *Russkaia literatura* (Leningrad) 2:54–66.

"Protiv chego vystupaet *Novyi* mir?" (1969) signed by Mikhail Alekseev, Sergei. Vikulov, Sergei Voronin, Vitaly Zakrutkin, Anatoly Ivanov, Sergei Malashkin, Aleksandr Prokofev, Pyotr Proskurin, Sergei Smirnov, Vladimir Chivilikhin and Nikolai Shundik, *Ogonek,* 26 July 1969:26–29; reprinted (1989) in *MS* 1:175–9; excerpts in Dunlop (1983b) *Faces:* 322–6.

"Proza Valentina Rasputina" (1977) contributions by O.Salynsky, V.Oskotsky, Iury Seleznyov and E.Starikova *VL* 2:3–81.

Rakowska-Harmstone, Teresa (1974) "The dialectics of nationalism in the USSR", *PC* XXIII(3) (May–June): 1–22.

——(1982) "A Political Perspective", *IJSL* 33:101–11 (role of Russian language).

Ramet, Pedro (ed.) (1984) *Religion and Nationalism in Soviet and East European Politics* (Duke Press Policy Studies), Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Rashidov, Sharaf R. (1983) *Bratskoe sotrudnichestvo narodov SSSR na etape zrekgo sotsializma,* Tashkent: Izd. TsK KP Uzbekistana.

Rasputin, Valentin G. (1976) [Interview with Evgeny Osetrov] "Byt' samim soboi", *VL* 9: 142–50.

——(1981) *Money for Maria and Borrowed Time: Two Village Tales,* trans. Kevin Windle and Margaret Wettlin, London and New York: Quartet.

——(1982) *Chetyre povesti. Proshchanie s Materoi. Zhivi i pomni. Poslednii srok. Den'gi dlia Marii*, Leningrad: Lenizdat.

——(1983) "Deiateli sovetskoi kul'tury o Dostoevskom. V.G.Rasputin", in G.M. Fridlender (ed.) *Dostoevskii. Materialy i issledovaniia,* Vol. V, Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoe otdelenie (pp. 66–7).

——(1985) "Pozhar. Povest'", NS 7:3–38.

——(1988) "'Zhertvovat' soboiu dlia pravdy'. Protiv bespamiatstva. Vystuplenie na V s"ezde Vserossiiskogo obshchestva okhrany pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury (g. Gor'kii, iiul', 1987g.)",*NS* l:169–76.

——(1989) "Vystuplenie na S"ezde narodnykh deputatov SSSR", *NS* 8:133–6.

——(1991) *Farewell to Matyora,* trans. Antonina W.Bouis, foreword: Kathleen Parthé, Evanston, III.: Northwestern University Press.

Reddaway, Peter (1980) "Policy towards dissent since Khrushchev", in T.H.Rigby, Archie Brown and Peter Reddaway (eds) *Authority, Power and Policy in the USSR: Essays Dedicated to Leonard Schapiro,* London: Macmillan/New York, St. Martin's.

——(1983) "Dissent in the Soviet Union", *PC* XXXII(6) (November–December): 1–15.

Redlich, Shimon (1982) *Propaganda and Nationalism in Wartime Russia: The Jewish Antifascist Committee in the USSR, 1941–1948,* [Boulder, Colo.]: East European Quarterly.

"Revoliutsiia, narod, istoriia", *Kommunist* 15 (October 1979): 10–21.

Reznik, Semyon (1982) "Kto takoi Sergei Semanov?" *Novaia gazeta* (New York), 11–17 December.

Rosenko, M.N. (1982) "Rol' russkoi sotsialisticheskoi natsii v razvitii i ukreplenii internatsional'nogo edinstva sovetskogo naroda", *Istoriia SSSR* 1 (January–February): 50–61.

Roshchin, Boris (1977) "Svoboda religii i klevetniki", *LG* 13 and 20 April 1977; English (abridged): *RCL* V(3) (Autumn), 186–91.

Rothberg, Abraham (1972) *The Heirs of Stalin: Dissidence and the Soviet Regime, 1953–1970,* Ithaca, N.Y., and London: Cornell University Press.

Rukhadze, A.K. (1975) *Jews in the USSR: A Collection of Articles,* Moscow: Novosti.

"Russian Nationalism Today", *RLRB* special edn, 19 December 1988.

"'Russkaia ideia': problemy kul'tury—problemy kinematografa", (1988) *Iskusstvo kino* 6: 118–31.

Rywkin, Michael (1982) *Moscow's Muslim Challenge: Soviet Central Asia,* London: Hurst.

Sakwa, Richard (1992) "Christian Democracy in Russia", *RSS* XX(2): 135–200.

——(1996a) "The Communist Party of the Russian Federation and the electoral process", *Studies in Public Policy* 265, Centre for the Study of Public Policy, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow.

——(1996b) *Russian Politics and Society,* 2nd edn, London: Routledge.

Scammell, Michael (1985) *Solzhenitsyn: A Biography,* London: Hutchinson.
——(ed. and intro.) (1995) *The Solzhenitsyn Files: Secret Soviet Documents Reveal One Man's Fight against the Monolith,* trans. Catherine A.Fitzpatrick *et al,* Chicago: edition q.
Scanlan, James P. (1996) "The Russian idea from Dostoevskii to Ziuganov", *PPC* XLIII (4) (July–August), 35–42.
Schapiro, Leonard B. (1955) *The Origin of the Communist Autocracy: Political Opposition in the Soviet State. First Phase, 1917–1922,* London: Bell.
——(1970) *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union,* rev. edn, London: Methuen.
Schneider, Eberhard (1979) "The discussion of the new all-union constitution in the USSR", *SS* XXXI(4) (October): 523–41.
Schwarz, Solomon M. (1951) *The Jews in the Soviet Union,* foreword: Alvin Johnson, Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.
Seleznyov, Iury I. (1978) *Sozidaiushchaia pamiat',* Moscow: Biblioteka Ogonek: 21.
——(1980) "'Chtoby starye rasskazyvali, a molodye pomnili!' Istoricheskie korni traditsii russkoi voinskoi poezii", *NS* 3:176–84.
Semanov, Sergei N. (1970) "O tsennostiakh otnositel'nykh i vechnykh", *MG* 8:308–320.
Service, Robert (1997) *A History of Twentieth-Century Russia,* London, New York, Toronto: Allen Lane/Penguin.
Sevastianov, Vitaly V. (1981) "Razmyshliaia o budushchem", *NS* 6:173–75 (Fyodorov).
Shafarevich,IgorR.(1989)"Rusofobiia",.*NS*6:167–92, 11:162–72.
Shaffer, Harry G. (1974) *The Soviet Treatment of Jews,* New York: Praeger.
Shatz, Marshall S. (1976) "From *Under the Rubble* and its predecessors", *CASS* X(l) (Spring): 111–17.
——(1980) *Soviet Dissent in Historical Perspective,* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
Shipler, David K. (1984) *Russia: Broken Idols, Solemn Dreams,* London: Macdonald (New York: Times Books, 1983).
Shneidman, N.N. (1975) "Soviet theory of literature and the struggle around Dostoevsky in recent Soviet scholarship", *SR* XXXIV(3) (September): 523–38.
——(1979) *Soviet Literature in the 1970s: Artistic Diversity and Ideological Conformity,* Toronto, Buffalo, New York, London: University of Toronto Press.
——(1983) "Man, nature and the *roots* in recent Soviet Russian prose", in Cioran, Samuel D., Smyrniw, Walter and Thomas, George (eds) *Essays in Honour of Louis Shein,* Hamilton, Ont.: McMaster University (pp. 125–33).
——(1989) *Soviet Literature in the 1980s: Decade of Transition,* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Sidorov, Evgeny Iu. (1984) "Zhurnal'naia kritika segodnia", *VL* 3:28–49.
Simmonds, George W. (ed.) (1977) *Nationalism in the USSR and Eastern Europe in the Era of Brezhnev and Kosygin,* papers and proceedings of Symposium held University of Detroit, 3–4 October 1975, Detroit: University of Detroit Press.
Simmons, Ernest J. (ed.) (1955) *Continuity and Change in Russian and Soviet Thought,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press/London: OUP.
Simon, Gerhard (1974) *Church, State and Opposition in the USSR,* trans. Kathleen Matchett, London: Hurst/Berkeley: University of California Press.
Siniavsky, Andrei D. (1978) "Nazyvaia imena", *Sintaksis:* 2:48–62 (anti-Semitism).
———(1979) "Solzhenitsyn and Russian nationalism: an interview with Andrei Sinyavsky" [By Olga Carlisle], *NYRB,* 22 November 1979:3–6.

Slater, Wendy N. (1998) "Imagining Russia: the ideology of Russia's patriotic opposition, 1985–1995", PhD thesis, University of Cambridge.

——(1999) "The patriots' Pushkin", *SR* LVIII: 2 (Summer): 407–27.

Smirnov, V, and Volgin, A. (1980) "Prepodobnyi Andrei Rublev, ikonopisets", *ZhMP* 7: 69–79.

Snigireva, Tatiana A. (1997) *A.T.Tvardovskii. Poet i ego epokha, Ekaterinburg*: Izd. Ural'skogo univ.

Solchanyk, Roman (1982) "Russian Language and Soviet Politics", *SS* XXXIV(1) January): 23–42.

Soloukhin, Vladimir A. (1966) "Pis'ma iz Russkogo Muzeia", *MG* 9:236–78, 10:245–87 (reprinted, with cuts (1972), together with "Chernye doski" in his *Slavianskaia tetrad',* Moscow: Sovetskaia Rossiia).

——(1969) "Chernye doski. Zapiski nachinaiushchego kollektsionera", *Moskva* 1: 129–87 (English: (1971) *Searching for Icons in Russia,* trans. PS. Falla, London: Harvill).

——(1980) "Vremia sobirat' kamni", *Moskva* 2:186–212.

——(1981) "Kameshki na ladoni", *MS* 3:30–47. (There are other articles and a book by Soloukhin with this title, but this was particularly attacked.)

——(1982) *Honey on Bread: Short Stories,* Moscow: Progress.

——(1988a) *Scenes from Russian Life,* trans and intro. David Martin, London: Peter Owen.

——(1988b) "Pochemu ia ne podpisalsia pod tem pis'mom", *MS* 12:186–9.

——(1990) *Laughter over the Left Shoulder,* trans. David Martin, London: Peter Owen/ Chester Springs, Penn: Dufour.

Solovei, Valery D. (1994) "Russkii natsionalizm i vlast' v epokhu Gorbacheva", in Paul Goble and Gennady Bordiugov (eds) *Mezhnatsional'nye otnosheniia v Rossii i SNG. Seminar Moskovskogo Tsentra Karnegi,* Vyp. I: *doklady 1993–1994 gg.* Moscow: AIRO-XX (pp. 45–72).

Solovei, Valery D. and Erunov, I.A.. (1991) *Russkoe delo segodnia.* Bk I. *Pamiat',* Moscow: Tsentr po izucheniiu mezhnatsional'nykh otnoshenii.

Solovyov, Vladimir S. (1989) "Stat'i i pis'ma", comp. R.Galtseva, intro. Sergei S.Averintsev,NM 1:194–234.

Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr I. (1962) "Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha. Povest'", *NM* 11:8–74 (English: (1963) *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich,* trans. Ralph Parker, Harmondsworth, Middx: Penguin).

——(1973) "Matrenin dvor", NM 1963(1): 42–63 (English: in his *Stories and Prose Poems,* trans. Michael Glenny, Harmondsworth, Middx: Penguin (pp. 9–47)).

——(1974/1989) "Zhit' ne po Izhi", 12 February 1974; afterword Igor Vinogradov (1989) *Vek XX i mir* 2:22–5.

——(1977) "Sakharov and the criticism of A Letter to the Soviet Leaders'", trans. Barry Rubin, in Vladimir E.Maksimov (ed.) *Kontinent: The Alternative Voice of Russia and Eastern Europe,* Sevenoaks, Kent: Coronet (pp. 30–8).

——(1980) *The Oak and the Calf: Sketches of Literary Life in the Soviet Union,* trans. Harry Willets, n.p.: Collins and Harvill (original: (1975) *Bodalsia Telenok s Dubom,* Paris: YMCA Press).

——(1982) "Otryvki iz vtorogo toma 'Ocherkov literaturnoi zhizni'", *Vestnik* 137: 120–30.

——(1983) "K 20-letiiu vykhoda v svet 'Odnogo dnia Ivana Denisovicha'. Interv'iu dlia radio Bi-Bi-Si" (with Barry Holland), *Vestnik* 138:155–63 (English: "20 years in the life of Ivan Denisovich", trans. Mary Seton-Watson, *The Listener,* 28 October 1982: 2–4, 9).

——(1991) "Kak nam obustroit' Rossiiu?", in both *KP* and LG, 18 September 1990 (English: *Rebuilding Russia,* New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux).

——(1995) *The Russian Question at the End of the 20th Century,* trans. Yermolai Solzhenitsyn, London: Harvill (first published (1994) in *Nouyi mir).*

——(1997) "As lacking in public responsibility as the Communist regime", *Transition* 10 January: 50–2, 56.

——(1998) *Rossiia v obvale,* Moscow: Russkii put'.

Sorokin, Valentin (1977) "Dmitrii Donskoi", NS 12:119–34 (poem).

Spechler, Dina R. (1982) *Permitted Dissent in the USSR: Novy mir and the Soviet Regime,* New York: Praeger.

Spence, Timothy Michael (1998) "The development of Russian nationalism under Gorbachev (1985–91)", PhD thesis, SSEES, University of London.

Spier, Howard (1987) "Soviet antisemitism unchained: the rise of the 'Historical and Patriotic Association "Pamyat"' ", Institute of Jewish Affairs *Research Report: 3* (July).

"Spustia vosem' vekov", *Kommunist* 10 (July 1985): 45–59.

Stal, Isabelle (1983) '"De Profundis' ou la critique de la raison revolutionnaire", *CMRS* XXIV(1–2) (January–June): 59–81.

Stalin, Josef V. (1941 [1934]) "O stat'e Engel'sa 'Vneshniaia politika russkogo tsarizma'", *Bol'shevik* 9 (May): 1–5.

Steele, Jonathan (1995) *Eternal Russia: Yeltsin, Gorbachev and the Mirage of Democracy,* London: Faber.

Stefan, Metropolitan of Sofia (1948) "Rech' proiznesennaia Blazhenneishim Mitropolitom Sofiiskim Stefanom, Ekzarkhom Bolgarskim", *ZhMP* 8:13–18.

Stepun, Fedor A. (1935/1936) *The Russian Soul and Revolution,* trans. Erminie Huntsen, New York and London: Scribner's.

Stern, August M. (ed.) (1978) *The USSR versus Dr Mikhail Stern: An "Ordinary" Trial in the Soviet Union,* trans. Marco Carynnyk. London: Cape.

Stroyen, William B. (1967) *Communist Russia and the Russian Orthodox Church, 1943–1962,* Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press.

Struve, Nikita (1980) "Chto sluchilos' s o. Dimitriem Dudko?" *Vestnik.* 132:230–2.

Suny, Ronald Grigor (1993) *The Revenge of the Past: Nationalism, Revolution, and the Collapse of the Soviet Union,* foreword: Norman M.Naimark, Stanford, Cal: Stanford University Press.

Sushchenko, Vladimir, and Tiurin, Iury (1980) "Cherez Zasechnuiu chertu na Pole Kulikovo. Ocherk-puteshestvie. K 600-letiiu Kulikovskoi bitvy i 500-letiiu osvobozhdeniia Rusi ot zolotoordynskogo iga", *Moskva* 7:154–68.

Szporluk, Roman (1979) "History and Russian Nationalism", *Survey* XXIV(3) (Summer): 1–17.

——(1989) "Dilemmas of Russian Nationalism", *PC*XXXVIII(4) (July–August): 15–35.

Tadevosian, E.V. (comp.) (1981) *V.I.Lenin, KPSS o sovetskom mnogonatsional'nom gpsudarstve,* Moscow: Politizdat.

Tishkov, Valery (1997) *Ethnicity, Nationalism and Conflict in and After the Soviet Union: The Mind Aflame,* London: Sage/PRIO/UNRISD.

Tökés, Rudolf L. (ed.) (1975) *Dissent in the USSR: Politics, Ideology and People,* Baltimore, Md. and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tolz, Vera (1998a) "Conflicting 'homeland myths' and nation-state building in postcommunist Russia", *SR* LVII(2) (Summer): 267–94.

——(1998b) "Forging the Nation: National Identity and Nation Building in Post-Communist Russia", *EAS,* L(6) (September): 993–1022.

Troepolsky, Gavriil N. (1961) "Doroga idet v goru", *NM* 11:163–80 (village prose).

Troitsky, Evgeny (1991) *Vo&ozhdenie russkoi idei. Sotsial'no-Filosofskie ocherki,* Moscow: Vsemirnyi seminar "Russkaia ideia i vozrozhdenie Rossii".

Trotsky, Leon (1930) *My Life: The Rise and Fall of a Dictator,* London: Thornton Butterworth.

——(1954 [1928]) *The Draft Programme of the Communist International: A Criticism of Fundamentals,* intro. W.Sinclair, London: New Park.

——(1960 [1923]) *Literature and Revolution* trans. Rose Strunsky, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Truscott, Peter (1997) *Russia First: Breaking with the West,* London: Tauris.

Tucker, Robert C. (1981/2) "Swollen state, spent society: Stalin's legacy to Brezhnev's Russia", *FA* LX(2) (Winter): 414–35.

Tumarkin, Nina (1983) *Lenin Lives! The Lenin Cult in Soviet Russia,* Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press.

Umland, Andreas (1997) "The Post-Soviet Russian Extreme Right", review essay *PPC* XLIV(4) (July–August): 53–61.

Urban, George R. (1981) "Was Stalin (the Terrible) Really a 'Great Man'? A Conversation with W.Averell Harriman (President Roosevelt's Special Ambassador to Churchill and Stalin, 1941–1946)", *Encounter* LVII(5) (November): 20–38.

Urban, Joan Barth, and Solovei, Valerii D. (1997) *Russia's Communists at the Crossroads,* Boulder, Colo.: Westview.

Urban, Michael (1998) "Remythologising the Russian state", *EAS* L(6) (September): 969–92.

Utechin, S.V. (1958) "Bolsheviks and their Allies after 1917: The Ideological Pattern", *SS* X(2) (October): 113–35.

——(1964) *Russian Political Thought: A Concise History,* London: Dent.

"V otdele propagandy TsK KPSS", *Zhurnalist* (1969) 5:78.

"V Tsentral'nom Komitete KPSS", *Pravda,* 30 July 1982 (decree on literature).

Vagin, Evgeny A. (1976) "Litsom k Rossii. Interv'iu E.A.Vagina *Posevu", Posev* 10: 52–9.

——(1977) "Interv'iu *Vestniku RKhD*" (August 1977), *Vestnik* 122:252–62.

——(1978) "Religioznoe inakomyslie v segodniashnei Rossii" (Rome, 1977), *RV*1: 50–70.

——(1982) "*Rodnoi prostor* A.Levitina-Krasnova", *Veche* (Munich): 6:164–79.

Valin, E. (1977) "V kakom mere 'russkii kommunizm'—ne russkii", *NZh*: 127 (June): 273–83.

Vikulov, Sergei V. (1971) "O derevne i 'derevenshchikakh'", *MG*6:276–7.

Vishnevskaia [Wishnewsky], Iuliia (1982) "The Arrest of Sergei Semanov", RL 416/82 (18 October 1982).

"Vladimir Osipov osuzhden na 8 let", *Vestnik* (1975) 116:257.

Vladimov, Georgy N. (1983) "Chto proiskhodit v strane" and "KGB protiv literatury", *Posev* 7:22–9, 8:37–43.

Volkov, Oleg V. (1978) "'Bez prikras, no i bez mery", review of B.Mozhaev, *Muzhiki i baby*", *NS* 11:185–90.
——(1979) "Ia uvidel Rossiiu", *NS* 3:174–83 (Glazunov).
——(1983) "Iagodnye mesta: vokrug da okolo", *NS* 12:170–3.
Voronov, Vladimir (1968) "Zaklinaniia dukhov", *Iunost'* 2:96–9.
"VIII s"ezd pisatelei SSSR. Vystupleniia uchastnikov s"ezda", *LG* 2 July 1986.
"Vsegda aktual'naia tema", *Kommunist* 8 (May 1981):38–48.
"Vsesoiuznaia perepis' naseleniia", *Vestnik statistiki* (1980) 2:11–30.
Wachtel, Andrew Baruch (1994) *An Obsession with History: Russian Writers Confront the Past,* Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press.
Walters, Philip M. (1976) "A new creed for Russians? The ideas of the neo-Slavophils", *RCL* IV(3) (Autumn): 20–31.
——(1977) "Vladimir Osipov: loyal opposition?" *RCL* V(4) (Winter): 229–34.
——(1981) "The ideas of the Christian seminar", *RCL* IX(3–4) (Autumn): 111–26.
Webber, Mark (1997) *CIS Integration Trends: Russia and the Former Soviet South,* London: RIIA.
White, Stephen (1979) *Political Culture and Soviet Politics,* London: Macmillan.
White, Stephen, Rose, Richard and McAllister, Ian (1997) *How Russia Votes,* Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House.
Wimbush, S.Enders (1979) "The Russian Nationalist Backlash", *Survey* XXIV(3) (Summer): 36–50.
Wortman, Richard (1968) "The New Soviet Intelligentsia and Russia's Past", *Midway* VIII(3) (Winter): 21–37.
Zalygin, Sergei P. (1964) "Na Irtyshe (Iz khroniki sela Krutye Luki)", NM 2:3–80.
——(1980) "Posle buri. Roman" (Book I), *DN* 4:5–59, 5:32–136.
——(1982) "Posle buri. Roman" (Book II), *DN* 5:7–115 (the conclusion [Okonchanie] was published (1987) as *Roman-gazeta* 21).
Zaslavsky, Victor (1980) "The ethnic question in the USSR", *Telos* 45 (Fall): 45–76.
Zekulin, Gleb (1967) "Aspects of peasant life as portrayed in contemporary Soviet literature", CSS I(4) (Winter): 552–65.
Zernov, Fr Mikhail (1948) "Mitropolit Livanskii Iliia i arkhimandrit Antiokhiiskogo patriarkhata Vasilii v gostiakh u patriarkha Moskovskogo i vseia Rusi Aleksiia", *ZhMP* 1: 45–56.
Zhirinovsky, Vladimir V. (1993) *Poslednii brosok na iug,* Moscow: LDP.
Zhukov, Dmitry (1969) "'Sviaz' vremen', review of E.Osetrov, *Poznanie Rossii", MG* 6: 300–4.
Ziuganov, Gennady A. (1993) *Drama vlasti: Stranitsy politicheskoi avtobiografii,* Moscow: Paleia.
——(1995a) *Rossiia i sovremennyi mir,* Moscow: Obozrevatel'.
——(1995b) *Veriu v Rossiiu,* Voronezh: Voronezh.
——(1997) *My Russia: The Political Autobiography of Gennady Zyuganov,* ed. Vadim Medish, Armonk, N.Y.: M.E.Sharpe.
Ziuganov, Gennady A. (chief ed.) and Podberezkin, Aleksei I. (chief author) (1995) *Sovremennaia Russkaia Ideia i Gosudarstvo,* Moscow: RAU-Korporatsiia/ Obozrevatel'.

Samizdat

Periodicals

Khronika tekushchikh sobytii (M.)*,* Nos 1 (30 April 1968) to 64 (30 June 1982): the most important journal of the human rights movement in the Brezhnev era. In the Arkhiv samizdata: Nos. 1–20 published in special issues of *Posev,* Nos. 21–27 in *VS* 1–6; Nos. 28–64 published in New York by Khronika Press (English: *A Chronicle of Current Events (CCE)).* Issues 1–11 published (1972) in Peter Reddaway (ed., intro. and trans.) *Uncensored Russia: The Human Rights Movement in the Soviet Union. The Annotated Text of the Unofficial Moscow Journal. A Chronicle of Current Events* (Nos 1–11) foreword Julius Telesin, London: Cape; New York: American Heritage. Issues 16–64 published by Amnesty International in London.

Mnogaya leta (M.), ed. Gennady M.Shimanov: No. 1 (1980) and No. 2 (1981) are at Keston Institute.

Moskovskii sbornik (M.), comp. Leonid I.Borodin: No. 1 (September 1974), *AS* 2050; no. 2 (January 1975) summarized in *CCE* 35 (31 March 1975):148; No. 3 confiscated by KGB.

Nadezhda. Khristianskoe chtenie (M.), comp. Zoia A.Krakhmalnikova, 1977–82: ten issues published by Possev in Frankfurt; excerpts from Nos. 2 to 6 in VS 44 (1981).

Obshchina. Zhurnal khristianskogo seminara [M.], ed. Aleksandr I.Ogorodnikov: No. 2 (probably beginning of 1978), incomplete, *AS* 3452 (*MS* 3/79); published in *VS* 39 (1980): 51–77; and, with introductory article by Evgeny A.Vagin, *RV* (1978) 2: 69–84.

Politcheskii dnevnik (M.), ed. Roy A.Medvedev, monthly: No. 1 (October 1964) to No. 80 (March 1971). Two volumes of the available issues were published in Russian, under the title of the journal, by the Alexander Herzen Foundation, Amsterdam, in 1972 and 1975. I have cited from the English edition, which is collected from a larger number of issues: *An End to Silence: Uncensored Opinion in the Soviet Union. From Roy Medvedev's Underground Magazine, Political Diary* (1982), ed. Stephen F.Cohen, trans. George Saunders, New York and London: Norton/Toronto: McLeod.

V svete preobrazheniia. Ezhenedel'naia pravoslavnaia gazeta (Grebnevo, Moscow obl.); originally also known as *Grebnevskie listki,* ed. Fr Dimitry S.Dudko: No. 1 (3 September 1978) to 3rd year (1980) 1 (69) (20 January 1980); extracts in *VS* 33 (1979): 51–119; *Vestnik* 129 (1979):269–80; *Vestnik* 130 (1979):355–60.

Veche (Aleksandrov, Vladimir obl.), Nos. 1–9, ed. Vladimir N.Osipov; No. 10, ed. Ivan V. Ovchinnikov: No. 1 (January 1971) *AS* 1013; No. 2 (19 May 1971) *AS* 1020; No. 3 (19 September 1971) *AS* 1108; No. 4 (31 January 1972) *AS* 1140; No. 5 (25 May 1972) AS 1230; No. 6 (19 October 1972) *AS* 1599; No. 7 (19 February 1973), incomplete, *AS* 1775; No. 8 (19 July 1973) *AS* 1665; No. 9 (19 December 1973) *AS* 2040; all in *SDS* XXI; No. 10(19 April 1974) *AS* 2452; No. 5 is *VS,* Nos. 9–10 (1973); extracts from Nos. 6–10 are in *VS,* Nos. 17–18 (1975).

Zemlia (Aleksandrov, Vladimir obl.), ed. Vladimir N.Osipov: No. 1 (1 August 1974) *AS* 1909 (*MS* 13/75); No. 2 (25 November 1974) *AS* 2060 (*MS* 25/75). Substantial extracts in *VS* 20 (1975). Recommenced publication with No. 3 towards the end of 1987.

Books, articles, documents and collections

Articles first published in the periodicals listed above are excluded.

Agursky, Mikhail S, "Neonatsistskaia opasnost' v Sovetskom Soiuze" [M., mid-1974]: *AS* 1858; *NZh* 118 (March 1975): 199–227; English: in Meerson-Aksenov and Shragin (eds) *Political, Social,* pp. 414–48.

Aksiuchits, Viktor, "Russkaia ideia", M., 1985-February 1988: AS 6243 (*MS* 33/88); published in *Vybor. titeraturno-filosofskii zhurnal russkoi khristianskoi kul'tury:* 3, M., January-March 1988.

Altaev, O. (pseud.), "Dvoinoe soznanie intelligentsii i psevdokul'tura": *AS* 897; *Vestnik* 97 (1970):8–32; English: *Survey* XIX(1) (Winter 1973): 92–113; and in Meerson-Aksenov and Shragin (eds) *Political, Social,* pp. 116–47.

Amalrik, Andrei A, *Prosushchestvuet li Sovetskii Soiuz do 1984g.?:* Moscow and Akulovo, April-June 1969; Amsterdam: Alexander Herzen Foundation, 1970; English: Hilary Sternberg (ed.) (1980) *Will the Soviet Union Survive until 1984?,* Harmondsworth, Middx: Penguin (pp. 13–63).

Anon. (1969) "Vserossiiskii sotsial-khristianskii soiuz osvobozhdeniia naroda: sostav, programma, melody raboty, ideologicheskie pozitsii, prichiny porazheniia": *AS* 525 *(SDSVll); Posev* (1971) 1:38–43.

Anon. (1976) "Father Dmitri Dudko: an eye-witness account" and other documents on Dudko: *RCLIV(2)* (Summer): 21–31.

Anonimnoe soobshchenie Samizdata ob obyske v kvartire Petra Maksimovicha Goriacheva v Leningrade 1.4.74. [April 1974] AS 1793 (*MS* 32/74). On KGB investigation into *Veche* collaborators in Leningrad.

Borodin, Leonid I. "Po povodu vystavki I.Glazunova": M., July 1978; *RV* 5 (1979): 60–73.

Brumberg, Abraham (ed.) (1970) *In Quest of Justice: Protest and Dissent in the Soviet Union Today,* New York: Praeger/London: Pall Mall (Samizdat documents and Western analyses).

"Chto zhdet Sovetskii Soiuz? Sbornik statei po povodu 'Pis'ma k vozhdiam' A.Solzhenitsyna", ed. and foreword Mikhail S.Agursky, M., 1974: *AS* 2450 (*MS* 43/82). I know of no other samizdat anthology, constructed within the USSR, which contains such a broad spectrum of views.

"Delo A.Argentova", *Vestnik* 119 (1976):281–95 (collection).

"Delo sviashch. D.Dudko", *Vestnik* 117 (1976):240–62 (documents on his dismissal, 1975).

"Delo sviashchennika Dmitriia Dudko", M., 1974: *Vestnik* 112–13 (1974): 261–81 (on his removal from Moscow, 1974).

Demokraty Rossii, Ukrainy i Pribaltiki. *Programma Demokraticheskogo dvizheniia Sovetskogo Soiuza,* October 1969: *AS* 340 (*SDS,* Vol. V), Amsterdam: Alexander Herzen Foundation, 1970.

Dudko, Fr Dimitry S. (1980) "Chto znachit mif o Rossii", *RV* 10:57–65.

——"Kreshchenie na Rusi", [M.,] 1961–1974: *AS* 2472a; *Vestnik* 117 (1976): 188–208, 119 (1976):254–80.

——"O chem propovedovat'?" July-August 1977: *RV2* (1978): 10–26.

——*0 nashem upovanii. Besedy,* M. (1974); Paris (1975): YMCA Press; English (1977): *Our Hope,* trans. Paul D.Garrett, foreword John Meyendorff, Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

——"Otvet na pis'ma moikh dukhovnykh detei", 23 August 1976: *Vestnik* 119 (1976): 321–30.

——"Pis'mo ot o. D.Dudko", 7 March 1981, to Nikita Struve: *Vestnik* 133 (1981): 293.

——"S russkoi Golgofy", Nakhabino, 26 August 1977: *RV* 4 (1978): 5–11, 9 (1980): 44–9.

Dunlop, John B. (ed.) (1975) *Vserossiiskii Sotsial-Khristianskii Soiuz Osvobozhdeniia Naroda. Programma, sud, v t'iurmakh i lageriakh,* Paris: YMCA Press.

Dziuba [Dzyuba], Ivan, *Internationalism or Russification? A Study in the Soviet Nationalities Problem* [Kiev, December 1965], pref. M.I.Holubenko; 3rd edn, New York: Monad, 1974; original: *Internatsionalizm chy rusyfikatsiia?,* Munich: Suchasnist, 1968.

"From the transcript of the trial of Vladimir Poresh", trans. Philip Walters: *RCL* X(3) (Winter 1982): 344–50 (on *Obshchina*).

Gajauskas, Balis, "Koe-chto o Dudko", "Na pol'zu imperii", and "Narod i zakon", Kuchino camp, Perm obl., [not before June] 1980: *AS* 4327 (*MS* 23/81), trans. from the original Lithuanian.

Galanskov, Iury T. [Author not confirmed.] "K proektu programmy Vsemirnogo soiuza storonnikov vseobshchego razoruzheniia" , 1961: AS *244* (SD*SIV*)*;* RM, *20 A*pril 1968.

——"V Komitet Gosudarstvennoi Bezopasnosti", M., 27 October 1961: *AS* 230 *(SDS* IV); *RM,* 20 April 1968 (on arrest of Osipov and others).

Giriaev, E. "Religiozno-filosofskii seminar v Leningrade": *Vestnik* 123 (1977): 169–74 (originally in *37).*

Giriaev, N. "Obzor materialov, opublikovannykh v samizdatskom zhurnale *37": Vestnik* 121 (1977):294–306.

Goricheva, Tatiana M. "Khristianstvo i kul'tura. (doklad, prochitannyi na religioznofilosofskom seminare) oktiabr' 1977 g.": AS 3329 (*MS* 33/78).

——"Khristianstvo i kul'tura. Zdes' i teper'. Doklad, prochitannyi na religioznofilosofskom seminare 17 fevralia 1978 g.", L.: *AS 3307* (*MS* 29/78).

——"O neofitsial'noi kul'ture i Tserkvi": *Posev* (1979) 9:45–7 (read to the religious and philosophical seminar in Leningrad, June 1979).

——"The religious significance of unofficial Soviet culture": *RCL* VIII(3) (Autumn 1980): 230–2 (read to the seminar on 16 September 1979; in *37* 19 (September-December 1979)).

Gorsky, V. (pseud.), "Russkii messianizm i novoe natsional'noe soznanie", 1969: *AS* 899 (*SDS* XXVI); *Vestnik* 97 (1970): 33–68; English: Meerson-Aksenov and Shragin (eds) *Political, Social,* pp. 353–93.

Iakunin, Fr Gleb P. "Moskovskaia Patriarkhiia i 'kul't lichnosti' Stalina", M., 17 October 1976: *RV* 1(1978):103–37; *RV 2* (1978):110–50.

——"O sovremennom polozhenii Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi i perspektivakh religioznogo vozrozhdeniia Rossii. Doklad Khristianskomu Komitetu zashchity prav veruiushchikh v SSSR", 15 August 1979: *AS* 3751 (*MS* 38/79); *VS* 35–36 (1979): 5–122.

Ibragimov, L. "Po povodu sbornika statei, posviashchennykh sud'bam Rossii, opublikovannogo v No. 97 zhurnala *Vestnik Russkogo Studencheskogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia": AS* 1358; *Vestnik* 106 (1972):309–14.

Iliakov, Vladislav V. (and six other former political prisoners who knew Vladimir Osipov), "Zaiavlenie po povodu vykhoda tak nazyvaemogo 10-go nomera *VECHE"* 25 May 1974: *AS 1790* (*MS* 32/74).

"I.R.", "Poza zmei. Po povodu sbornika *Mnogaia leta": Vestnik* 134 (1981): 271–6.

"Iu. T.Galanskov. Poet i chelovek": *Grani* 89–90 (1973): 143–203.

Khristianskii Komitet zashchity prav veruiushchikh v SSSR: documents 1–16 in *VS* 28 (1977) (whole issue); 1–4 are *AS* 2862 (*MS* 11/77). English: founding declaration, 27 December 1976, *RCL* VI(1) (Spring 1978): 33–4; critique of draft constitution of USSR, 8 June 1977, *ibid.:* 34–6. Later documents (in Russian) are in *VS* 35–36 (1979), whole issue.

Khristianskii patrioticheskii soiuz: collection of unpublished documents, headed "Perestroike—russkii dukh, russkuiu silu!", on foundation of Christian Patriotic Union in Moscow, 17 December 1988.

"Khristianskii seminar": *VS 39* (1980) (whole issue) (collection).

"Khristianskii seminar po problemam religioznogo vozrozhdeniia": *Posev* (1979) 2:5–7, with introduction, "O seminarakh A.Ogorodnikova".

"Klassika i my", discussion organized by Moscow Writers' Organization, 21 December 1977: *Poiski* (Paris edn) 2 (1980): 65–88; with Raisa B.Lert, "Vyskazannoe i nedoskazannye", August 1978, *ibid.:* 89–113.

Krivulin, Viktor, and Goricheva, Tatiana M. (1976) "Evangel'skie dialogi", *Vestnik* 118: 84–6 (originally in 37:1 (January 1976)).

Labedz, Leopold and Hayward, Max (eds) (1967) *On Trial: The Case of Sinyavsky (Tertz.) and Daniel (Arzhak)* London: Collins.

Levitin-Krasnov, Anatoly E. (1972) *Stromaty,* Frankfurt: Possev.

Lukin, S. "A new variation on an old theme", *SJA* XI(3) (1981):55–62, trans. from *Eureiskii samizdat* (Jerusalem), XXI (1980), 128–36; original in *Evrei v SSSR* 17 (semi-official anti-Semitism).

Mashkova (Osipova), Valentina E. "Otkrytoe pis'mo amerikanskomu senatoru", 3 December 1974: *AS* 1994 (MS 6/75) (to Henry Jackson, on arrest of her husband).

——"Otkrytoe pis'mo Valentiny Mashkovoi (Osipovoi)", 28 December 1974: *AS* 2002 (*MS* 6/75); *Posev* (1975) 3:6 (to world public opinion).

Medvedev, Roy A. (1975a) *On Socialist Democracy,* ed. and trans. Ellen de Kadt, London: Macmillan (rev. edn of *Kniga o sotsialisticheskoi demokratii,* M., 1971; Amsterdam: Alexander Herzen Foundation, 1972).

——(1975b) "Tvardovskii i Solzhenitsyn. K vykhodu v svet knigi A.I.Solzhenitsyna *Bodalsia telenok s dubom",* May–September 1975: *AS* 2376; English: R.Medvedev, *Political Essays,* trans. Tamara Deutscher, pp. 110–19.

——(1976a) *Political Essays,* Nottingham: Spokesman (includes articles on Solzhenitsyn).

——(1976b) *Let History Judge: The Origins and Consequences of Stalinism,* ed. David Joravsky, Nottingham: Spokesman (original: *K sudu istorii,* M., 1968).

——(ed.) (1977) *The Samizdat Register I,* London: Merlin (articles from *XX-yi vek).*

——(1982) *Khrushchev,* trans. Brian Pearce, Oxford: Blackwell (M., 1981).

——(1983) *All Stalin's Men,* trans. Harold Shukman, Oxford: Blackwell (M., 1982).

Medvedev, Roy A. and Medvedev, Zhores A. (1976) *Khrushchev: The Years in Power,* trans. Andrew R.Durkin, New York: Columbia University Press (Oxford: OUP, 1977).

Medvedev, Zhores A. (1973) *Ten Years after Ivan Denisovich,* trans. Hilary Sternberg, London: Macmillan/New York: Knopf (original: *Desiat' let posle "Odnogo dnia Ivana Denisovicha",* M., 1971).

Meerson-Aksenov, Mikhail and Shragin, Boris I. (eds), Haugh, Richard (consulting ed.) (1977) *The Political, Social and Religious Thought of Russian "Samizdat"—An Anthology,* trans. Nickolas Lupinin, Belmont, Mass.: Nordland (includes a wide range of material).

Naidenovich, Adel, and ten other "friends and supporters of *Veche",* "Po povodu vystupleniia V Osipova protiv zhurnala *Veche* (Zaiavlenie sotrudnikov zhurnala *Veche* i lichnykh znakomykh V Osipova)", 17 April 1974: AS 1787 (MS 32/74).

N.N. Introduction to "Metanoia": *AS 896; Vestnik:* 97 (1970): 4–7.

"O vykhode 10 nomera zhurnala *Veche",* anon. 20 April 1974: *AS* 1706 (*MS* 23/74).

"Obrashchenie chlenov khristianskikh Tserkvei v SSSR. V Prezidiium Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR; Vsemirnomu sovetu tserkvei", Ecumenical appeal by twenty-eight Christians from six denominations, 20 June 1976: *AS* 2575 (*MS* 25/76); *VS* 24 (1976): 63–82; *Vestnik* 118 (1976): 301–13.

Ogorodnikov, Aleksandr I. "Khristianskii kruzhok v Moskve", 1976, with other documents on the Christian Seminar and Ogorodnikov's case: *Vestnik* 119 (1976): 296–331; English trans. of Ogorodnikov's letter to Philip Potter, 27 July 1976, *RCL* IV(4) (Winter 1976): 45–7; Ogorodnikov and Boris Razveev, "Young Soviet Christians Form Seminar", *RCL* VII(1) (Spring 1979): 48–50.

Osipov, Vladimir N. (1972) "Berdiaevskii kruzhok v Leningrade", January 1972: *Posev* (1972) 11:3–10; *Vestnik* 104–105 (1972):153–65 (VSKhSON).

——"Beseda redaktora zhurnala *Veche* V.N.Osipova s korrespondentom Assoshieited Press Stivinzom Broningom i s korrespondentom gazety *Baltimor son* Dinom Milzom", 25 April 1972: *AS* 1468; *Vestnik* 106 (1972):296–303 (English in Dunlop, *Faces:* 301–8).

——"Ekstrennoe zaiavlenie dlia pechati" o prekrashchenii opublikovaniia zhurnala *Veche* s vypuska No. 9. 7 March 1974: *AS* 1705 (*MS* 23/74). ——"Gvozd' perestroiki", Tarusa, August 1987: *Veche* (Munich) 31 (1988):137–46.——"K chitateliam samizdata", 10 December 1971: *AS* 1171; *Grani* 85 (October 1972): 188–92 (supplements "Ploshchad' Maiakovskogo").

——"K voprosu o tseli i metodakh legal'noi oppozitsii", Aleksandrova, May 1974: *AS* 1760 (*MS* 26/74); VS 17–18(1975):3–13 (Solzhenitsyn's *Letter to the Soviet Leaders and* its critics).

——"Otkrytoe pis'mo" redaktsiiam gazet *Russkaia mysl'* i *Novoe russkoe slovo* ob izdanii samizdatskogo zhurnala *Zemlid",* Rozhdestveno, 7 August 1974: *AS* 1908 (AfS 6/75).

——"Piat' vozrazhenii Sakharovu", April 1974: *AS* 1696; *Vestnik* 115 (1974):215–19 (on Solzhenitsyn's *Letter to the Soviet Leaders*).

——"Pis'mo Senatoru Dzheksonu", 12 November 1974: A*S 1*992 (*MS 6/75).*

——"Pis'mo v redaktsiiu zhurnala *Vestnik RSKhD",* 26 November 1972: *Vestnik* 106 (1972):294–6.

——"Ploshchad' Maiakovskogo, stat'ia 70-ia", August 1970: *AS* 527 (*SDS* VII); *Grani* 80 (September 1971): 107–37, together with biographies of participants: 137–62.

——"Tri otnosheniia k Rodine", 25 March-2 April 1970: *AS* 1147; *Vestnik* 103 (1972): 216–22 (English: *Political, Social:* 394–403).

——(1978) *Tri otnosheniia k Rodine. Stat'i, ocherki, vystupleniia,* Frankfurt: Possev (contains many of his principal articles).

——"V Organizatsiiu 'Mezhdunarodnaia Amnistiia' (Emnesti Interneshenel) g-nu Shonu MakBraidu", 25 May 1974: *AS* 1761 (*MS* 26/74); *Vestnik* 112–13 (1974):304–5 (appeal for Ogurtsov).

——"Zaiavlenie redaktsii zhurnala *Veche",* 1 March 1971: *AS* 586 (SDS VIII).

——"Zaiavlenie V.N.Osipova", 10 May 1974: *AS* 1759; *Vestnik* 112–13 (1974):307–8.

Ovchinnikov, Ivan V. and Ivanov, Anatoly M. [Ivanov-Skuratov], open letter on Osipov's departure from *Veche,* Aleksandrov-M., n.d. but soon after 5 September 1974: *AS* 1966 (MS 6/75).

Pamiat', Council, "Obrashchenie patrioticheskogo istoriko-literaturnogo ob"edineniia Pamiat" k russkomu narodu, k vsem narodam nashei velikoi derzhavy, zhelaiushchim sokhranit' otechestvo svoe ot pozhara", 21 May 1986: *AS* 6079 (*MS* 37/87).

Pamiat', seven members of the Council (Kim Andreev *et al.*), "Vozzvanie patrioticheskogo ob"edineniia 'Pamiat" k russkomu narodu, k patriotam vsekh stran i natsii", M., 8 December 1987: AS 6138 (MS 5/88).

Petrov-Agatov, Aleksandr A., "Arestantskie vstrechi": *Grani* 82 (December 1971):99–126, 83 (May 1972):47–8, 84 (July 1972):56–96.

Pomerants, Grigory, "Son o spravedlivom vozmezdii (Moi zatianuvshiisia spor)", 3 March 1978: *Sintaksis* 6 (1980):13–87 (first published in *Pbiski* (M. edn.): 3).

"Press-konferentsiia na kvartire u o. Dmitriia Dudko 27.iv.77g. po povodu statei v *Literaturnoi gazete* 13 i 20 aprelia s.g.", speeches of lakunin and Dudko, and other documents. M, 27 April 1977: *AS* 3003 (MS 22/77).

Radugin, K., "Budi sie, budi!" [1970–2]: *AS* 1360 (*SDS* XXVI); *Vestnik:* 106 (1972): 315–19 (forthcoming resurrection of Orthodox Russia).

Rodionov, Viacheslav, "Zaiavlenie", 15 December 1974: *AS* 2061 (*MS* 10/75) (arrest of Osipov).

Russkaia ideia ili KGB? Kto—Glazunov? [Paris] Chasovoi [1977].

Sakharov, Andrei D., "On Alexander Solzhenitsyn's A Letter to the Soviet Leaders'", M., 3 April 1974: trans. Geoffrey Hosking, in Vladimir E.Maksimov (ed.) (1977) *Kontinent: The Alternative Voice of Russia and Eastern Europe,* Sevenoaks, Kent: Coronet, pp. 19–29 (original: "O pis'me Aleksandra Solzhenitsyna 'Vozhdiam Sovetskogo Soiuza'", *AS* 1655).

Samizdat I: la voix de l'opposition communiste en U.R.S.S. Comp. "1'organization trotskyste (pour la reconstruction de la IVe Internationale)", Paris: La Verité, 1969.

Saunders, George (ed.) (1974) *Samizdat: Voices of the Soviet Opposition,* New York: Monad.

Shafarevich, Igor R., "Odin primer", M., 25 December 1975: AS 2416 (MS 6/76); *Vestnik:* 117 (1976):249–50 (dismissal of Dudko).

——(1980) *The Socialist Phenomenon,* trans. William Tjalsma, foreword: Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, New York and London: Harper & Row/Toronto: Fitzhenry & Whiteside (original: (1975) *Sotsializm kak iavlenie mirovoi istorii,* Paris: YMCA Press).

Shafarevich, Igor R., and fifteen others, "Obrashchenie po povodu aresta Vladimira Osipova", 29 November 1974: *AS* 1993 *(MS 6/75).*

Shchipkova, Tatiana (1979) "Imeet li pravo sovetskii prepodavatel na svobodu sovesti?" *Vestnik* 130:345–54 (Moscow Christian Seminar).

Shimanov, Gennady M. "General'nomu Sekretariu Kommunisticheskoi Partii Sovetskogo Soiuza L.I.Brezhnevu", M., 1 August 1976: *Vestnik* 119 (1976): 291–3 (against internment of Argentov in psychiatric hospital).

——"Ideal'noe gosudarstvo", 29 May 1975: AS 2218.

——"Iz interv'iu sotrudniku samizdatskogo zhurnala *Evrei v SSSR": Vestnik:* 121 (1977): 119–26.

——"Kak ponimat' nashu istoriiu i k chemu v nei stremit'sia (v sviazi s pis'mom Solzhenitsyna)", M., 2June 1974: *AS* 1801 (*MS* 43/82).

——(1971) *Notes from the Red House,* Montreal: Monastery Press (original: "Zapiski iz Krasnogo doma", May-June 1969: AS 567 (*SDS* VIII); *Grani* 79 (1971):101–57). "O Tserkvi v sovremennoi Rossii (iz pis'ma)", Summer 1973: *AS* 1735.

——"Osnovanie dlia nadezhdy", M., 1 June 1976: Keston College, DS/1976/O/65 (the Christian transformation of Soviet power).

——"Otkrytoe pis'mo N.A.Struve", 1 February 1972: *AS* 1132 (*SDS XXII, MS* 30/72; = *AS* 2086:2–9).

——"Protiv techeniia", M., 1 February 1975: *AS* 2086 (a collection of sixteen of Shimanov's most important political and religious articles).

——"Sviateishemu Patriarkhu Moskovskomu i vseia Rusi Pimenu. Otkrytoe pis'mo", M., 15 July 1976: *Vestnik* 119 (1976):314–20 (English: *RCDA* XVI(7–9) (1979): 139–42).

——"Vtoroe Otkrytoe pis'mo N.A.Struve, redaktoru zhurnala *Vestnik RSKhD": Vestnik* 104–105 (1972):319–23 (against the "Metanoia" collection; with Struve's comments).

Shimanov, Gennady M. and Osipov, Vladimir N., "Tri pis'ma", *AS* 1846; Shimanov to Natalia Sergeevna, 25 October 1972, 1846a; Osipov, "Otkrytoe pis'mo Gennadiiu Shimanovu", Rozhdestveno, 29 April 1973, 1846b (= *AS* 1732; in *VS* 17–18 (1975): 13–19); Shimanov, "Kak otnosit'sia k sovetskoi vlasti (otvet V.N.Osipovu)", M., 30 June 1974, 1846c.

"Slovo natsii", signed "Russkie patrioty", attributed to Anatoly M.Ivanov (IvanovSkuratov) [c. 1970]: AS 590; *Veche* (Munich) 3 (1981):101–31; English extracts: *Survey* XVI(3) (Summer 1971):191–9.

Solmar, E.L. (1978) "Protocols of the anti-Zionists", *SJA* VIII:2, 57–66 (original in *Earei V SSSR* 14 (M., 1977)).

Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr I. (1974–8) *The Gulag Archipelago, 1918–1956: An Experiment in Literary Investigation,* 3 vols, Vols I and II: trans. Thomas P.Whitney; Vol. III: trans. Harry Willets, New York: Harper & Row/London: Collins & Harvill (original: (1973–6) *Arkhipelag GULag,* Paris: YMCA Press.

——(1974) *Letter to the Soviet Leaders,* trans. Hilary Sternberg, London: Index on Censorship (original: (1974) *Pis'mo vozhidiam Sovetskogo Soiuza,* Paris: YMCA Press.

Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr I., Agursky, Mikhail S., Barabanov, Evgeny, Borisov, Vadim, Korsakov, F. (pseud.), "A.B." and Shafarevich, Igor R., (1975) *From under the Rubble,* trans. under the direction of Michael Scammell, intro. Max Hayward, Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown/[Glasgow]: Fontana, 1976 (original: Iz-*pod glyb,* Paris: YMCA Press, 1974).

Svetov, Feliks G., "Otkrytoe pis'mo", [M., 19 August 1982]: *AS 4727* (*MS* 32/82); *RM* 11 September 1982; *Vestnik* 137 (1982): 265–70; English: *RCL* XI(2) (Summer 1983):

210–13 (activity of himself and his wife, Krakhmalnikova). See also *AS* 4725–6 (*MS* 32/82).

——"Pis'mo drugu", [M.,] 8–14 October 1982, *Nadezhda* and the KGB: *AS* 4758 (*MS* 38/82).

——"Predstaviteliam vsekh Pravoslavnykh tserkvei", [M.,] 8 August 1982: AS 4714 (*MS* 30/82) (arrest of Krakhmalnikova).

Tverdokhlebov, Andrei, "Zaiavlenie", 30 November 1974: *AS* 1953 (*MS* 1/75) (in defence of Osipov).

Vardomtsev, Viktor, "Vozmozhno li raskaianie i samoogranichenie bez proshcheniia?" M., March 1981: AS 4362 (*MS* 26/81) (Dudko).

Veche editorial board, "Ot redaktsii zhurnala *Veche",* 12 June 1974: *AS* 1791 (*MS 32*/74) (by the anti-Osipov faction, against Osipov).

——"Soobshchenie redaktsii zhurnala *Veche",* 9 July 1974: *AS* 1792 (*MS* 32/74) (*Veche* ceasing publication).

"Vokrug pis'ma Solzhenitsyna", *Vestnik* 103 (1972): 145–72; includes Solzhenitsyn's Lenten Letter to the Patriarch, Easter 1972 (English: *Solzhenitsyn: A Documentary Record:* 296–8); Fr Sergei Zheludkov's letter to Solzhenitsyn, *AS* 1107; and the replies to Zheludkov by Solzhenitsyn, *AS* 1144, and Feliks Karelin, *AS* 1145.

Volkov, Oleg V. (1986) "Zametki o glasnosti", M., May-June: AS 5761.

"VSKhSON. Materialy suda i programma", *VS:* 22 (1976), whole issue.

Index

Abalkin, Leonid 121
Abkhazia 131
Abovin-Egides, Pyotr 144
Abramov, Fyodor 71
Afghanistan 112;
  Soviet invasion of 81, 108, 112, 115–16, 145, 146
Agursky, Mikhail S. 95, 96, 99
Aitmatov, Chingiz 71, 96
Aksakov, Ivan Sergeevich 18, 47, 142, 143;
  arrest 27;
  and Dostoevsky's Pushkin speech 41;
  exiled 34;
  and Leontev 42;
  and pan-Slavism 25, 27;
  and Serbia's war against Turkey 33, 34;
  writing in *Den'* 31;
  writing in *Moskvich* 32
Aksakov, Konstantin Sergeevich 18, 25, 27, 31, 91, 142;
  and Crimean war 28;
  death 31;
  memorandum to Alexander II 30;
  "To Peter" 24
Aksenov, Vasily 74
Aksiuchits, Viktor 119–20, 126, 133
alcohol 68;
  measures taken by Gorbachev against 116
Alekseev, Mikhail 120, 121
Alekseeva, Liudmila 106–7
Aleksii I, Patriarch 58, 59, 65, 84
Aleksii II, Patriarch 127
Alexander I, Tsar 16, 17, 26
Alexander II, Tsar 34, 143;
  Aksakov's memorandum to 30;
  assassination 42
Alexander III, Tsar 34, 42, 144
All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Emancipation of the People *see* VSKhSON
All-Russian Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments *see* VOOPIiK
All-Russian Society for the Protection of Nature (VOOP) 70
All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists (AUCECB) 58
Altaev, O. 86
Amalrik, Andrei 84
Andreev, Kim 118
Andrei Rublev (film) 67, 114
Andropov, Iury Vladimirovich 96, 110, 112, 113
Anishchenko, Gleb 119
anti-Semitism *see* Jews
Antonov, Mikhail F. 85–6, 91–2, 121, 123, 137
Argentov, Aleksandr 103, 107
Armed Forces of the USSR 74, 110–11, 116, 125, 127, 128
Armenia 122, 127
art:
  and Russian nationalism 76–7;
  see also Glazunov
Asia:
  Russia's role in 41, 112, 145
Association of Russian Artists 122–3, 126
atheism 35, 43, 101
Avvakum, Archpriest 13

Azerbaijan 122, 125

Baku:
massacre in 125
Bakunin, Mikhail Aleksandrovich 35
Balkans 13, 33;
see also Russo-Turkish War;
Serbia;
Serbs
Baltic republics 122, 124, 126, 128
Barabanov, Evgeny 99, 125
Barkashov, Aleksandr 132
Begun, Iosif 107
Belarus 128, 138
Belorussians 38, 57, 59
Belov, Vasily Ivanovich 75, 76, 120, 121, 122, 132
Bely, Andrei 1, 52–3
Benjamin, Walter 50
Berdiaev, Nikolai Aleksandrovich 15, 46–7, 70, 83, 120, 125, 141;
definition of messianism 7;
on Dostoevsky 38;
on intelligentsia 46, 52;
The Russian Idea 55;
and Russian Marxism 52;
view of Russian Communism 54–5
Biulletin' khristianskoi obshchestvennosti (Christian Community Bulletin) 119
Black Hundreds 42, 88
Bloc of Public-Patriotic Groups of Russia 126
Blok, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich 1, 52, 53, 79
Bloom, Solomon F. 50
Bochevarov, Georgy 89
Bolsheviks 1, 2, 52, 53–4, 136, 142, 143
Bolshevism 52, 53, 54, 61, 86, 97, 98
Bondarchuk, Sergei 121
Bondarev, Iury 120, 126
Borisov, Vadim 97, 98
Borodin, Leonid Ivanovich 82, 84, 99, 110, 120;
attack on Metanoia Symposium 87;
on Glazunov's art 77;
and *Moskovskii sbornik* 96;
release 119;
trial and sentence 111;
and *Veche* 89
Bosnia-Herzegovina:
revolt (1875) 33
Brest-Litovsk treaty (1918) 52
Brezhnev, Leonid Ilich 68, 73, 96, 115
Brezhnev era 3, 64, 68–109, 142–3, 145–6;
cultural Russian nationalism 68–71;
dissident Russian messianism 82–109;
hostility to extreme forms of nationalism 81
Brodsky 28
Brothers Karamazov, The (Dostoevsky) 35, 36, 37, 41, 94
Brusilov, General A.A. 54
Bukharin, Nikolai 121
Bulgakov, Sergei N. 46, 51–2, 55, 104
Bulgaria:
revolt in 33
Bush, George, US President 136
Bykov, Vasyl 96
Byzantium 2, 11, 12, 13

capitalism 51, 55
Carlisle, Olga 77
Catherine II, the Great 16, 144
Catholicism 23, 24, 35, 47;
superiority to Orthodoxy belief 45;
union between Byzantine Church and Roman Catholic Church 12
censorship:
against Slavophilism 26–7;
easing of 30
Chaadev, Pyotr Iakovlevich 1, 4, 20–1, 45, 99, 111
Chalmaev, Viktor P. 71, 72, 73, 74, 78
Chechnia 131, 133, 135
Cheka 52
Chelovek i zakon (Person and Law) 30, 77
Cherkassky, Prince V.A. 27, 30
Chernenko, Konstantin Ustinovich 110, 113, 114
Chernobyl disaster (1986) 117
Chernomyrdin, Viktor Stepanovich 135, 137, 139
chiliasm 2, 6–7
China 45–6, 69, 97, 103, 142, 145, 146

"chosen people", concept of 6, 141
Christian Committee for the Defence of Believers' Rights in the USSR 107, 108, 109
Christian Democratic Union 126
Christian Patriotic Union 119
Christian Seminar 103, 105–6, 107–8, 111
Christianity 105;
and messianism 8–9;
Shimanov on 103;
Solovyov and reunification of 44, 45;
and Solzhenitsyn 99;
see also Orthodoxy;
Russian Orthodox Church
Christoff, Peter K. 22
Chronicle of Current Events, The 88–9
Chuev, Feliks 72
CIS (Commonwealth of Independent States) 128, 131–2, 138
"clash of civilizations", theory of 33
class messianism 61
Cohn, Norman 8
Cold War 147
collectivization 63
Comintern 53;
dissolution (1943) 57
Communism, Russian:
Berdiaev's view of 54–5
Communist Party of the RSFSR 124, 127, 128
Communist Party of the Russian Federation *see* CPRF
Community of Sovereign Republics (SSR) 138
Congress of Berlin (1878) 34
Congress of People's Deputies of the RFSR 126
Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR 115, 122, 123, 124, 126, 127, 128
Congress of People's Patriotic Forces 138
Congress of Russian Communities (KRO) 134
Constantinople 11;
fall of to Turks 12;
Russian conquest of as dream of messianists 28, 38, 44, 45
corruption 68–9, 130, 148
Cossacks 15
Council of People's Commissars 52
coup (1991) 128–9, 146
CPRF (Communist Party of the Russian Federation) 132, 135, 137, 138, 140, 146
CPSU (Communist Party of the Soviet Union) 54–129 *passim*
Crimea 132
Crimean War 25, 28–9
Cultural Foundation of the USSR 116–17
cultural Russian nationalism 68–81

Danilevsky, Nikolai lakovlevich 32, 33, 42, 83, 135
Davis, Horace B. 50
Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, A (Solzhenitsyn) 63–4
de-Stalinization 62, 143
Declaration of State Sovereignty of the RSFSR 126
Dementev, A.G. 72, 74
Demichev, P.N. 74
democracy 99, 101, 102
Democratic Russia movement 126, 127
Den' (*The Day*) 31, 127, 132
derevenshchiki 62–4, 67, 71, 74, 75, 76, 112, 143
derzhavnost' 135, 137
Deutscher, Isaac 54
Devils, The (Dostoevsky) 34, 35–6, 36–7, 71
Disraeli, Benjamin 38
dissident Russian nationalism 82–109, 119–20;
and Christian Committee 107, 108, 109;
and Christian Seminar 103, 105–6, 107–8, 111;
crackdown on individual dissidents by KGB 110–11;
and Father Dudko *see* Dudko, Father Dimitry;
and Russian Orthodox Church 2, 84–8;
and Shimanov 100–4;
and "Slovo natsii" document 88–9;
and Solzhenitsyn *see* Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr Isaevich;
three phases of 108–9;
and *Veche* see *Veche;*

and VSKhSON 67, 82–4, 108
dissidents:
crackdown on 108, 110–11;
releasing of 119
Dorosh, Efim 66
Dostoevsky, Fyodor Mikhailovich 1, 32, 34–42, 79, 87;
articles marking 160th anniversary of birth 111–12;
attacks on Catholicism and socialism 34–5;
belief in Russian people 37–8;
The Brothers Karamazov 35, 36, 37, 41, 94;
The Devils 34, 35–6, 36–7, 71;
The Diary of a Writer 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41;
and expansion of Russian power in Asia 41, 47, 145;
growth in interest in Brezhnev era 70–1;
idea of Russian as "universal person" 24;
influence on VSKhSON 83;
and Jews 38–40, 42, 122;
and Orthodoxy 37–8;
Pushkin speech (1880) 40–1, 111, 125
Dostoevsky, Mikhail Mikhailovich 32
Dudko, Father Dimitry 77, 84, 95, 96, 104–5, 106, 107;
arrest of and recantation of activities 108;
influence on Osipov 89;
statement regretting recantation 119
Dunlop John B. 4, 82, 120

Eastern Europe 60, 84, 125, 146, 147
economy 121, 148;
shock therapy 1, 130
Efros, Anatoly 78, 114
Ehrenburg, Ilia 66
Eikalovich, Father Superior Gennady 7
elections:
(1990) 126;
(1996) 138, 146
Ellis, Jane 107
Eltsin, Boris Nikolaevich 1, 118–19, 126, 127, 146;
elected President of RSFSR 128;
and ethnic minorities 131;
foreign policy 131, 137–8;
and (1996) elections 138;
and parliament crisis 132–3, 146;
sacking of Lebed 135
Emelianov, V.N. 119
Engels, Friedrich 41, 49, 50
environmental issues 117
Epokha (The Epoch) 32
Ermogen of Kaluga, Archbishop 84
Esenin, Sergei 52, 71
Eshliman, Father Nikolai I. 65, 66, 84, 85
Estonia 124, 127
Eurasianism 134, 135
Europe 32, 33;
revolutions 26
European idealism:
impact on Slavophilism 19
Evrei v SSSR (Jews in the USSR) 103
Evtushenko, Evgeny 74, 101, 122, 126

Fadeev, General Rostislav 33
February Revolution 101
federalism 56, 93
Federation for Slavonic Writing and Slavonic Cultures 123
Fetisov, A.A. 85–6
Filaret, Patriarch 13
Filofei (Philotheus) 11, 12, 13, 59, 86
First World War 46–7
Florensky, Father Pavel 104
Fonchenkov, Father Vasily 107
Foreign Censorship Committee 31
Franco-Prussian War 50
Frank, Joseph 21
French Revolution 16
From under the Rubble (Solzhenitsyn) 87, 96, 99, 144
FSU (former Soviet Union) 131, 132
Fyodorov, Nikolai F. 43–4, 47, 83, 143

Gaidar, Egor Timurovich 130, 133–4, 148
Gaj, Ljudevit 25
Galanskov, Iury 83
geopolitics 2;
strengthening of messianism 2–3

Georgia 122, 127, 128
Germany 10, 49, 50
Gillespie, David 76
glasnost' 30, 115, 146;
  beginnings of 116–22
Glazunov, Ilia Sergeevich 70, 71, 73, 90, 110, 118, 120, 126, 144;
  exhibition (1978) 77;
  "Mystery of the Twentieth Century" 76–7;
  and Rodina 69;
  trips abroad 76
Glenny, Michael 64
"God-building" movement 52
Gogol, Nikolai V. 1, 21
Golden Horde 79–80
Goldstein, David 39, 40
Golgotha theme 105, 106
Gorbachev, Mikhail Sergeevich 110, 124, 146;
  allies and opponents amongst nationalists 120;
  downfall 127–8;
  and *glasnost'* 115, 118;
  on Jews 119, 122;
  measures taken against alcohol 116;
  and nationality question 124–5;
  rejection of Shatalin Plan 127;
  and Russian Orthodox Church 125
Gorbachev era 115–129
Gorbacheva, Raisa Maksimovna 117
Gorchakov, A.M. 31, 33, 34
Goricheva, Tatiana 106
Gorsky, V. 86–7
gosudarstvenniki 77–8, 93, 144;
  growth of influence 3, 77;
  hostility towards Gorbachev 120;
  instigation of (1991) coup 146;
  on Kulikovo 79;
  positive attitude towards tsarism 78;
  supporters of strong state 3, 71, 80, 81, 142;
  and *vozrozhdentsy* 143
Grazhdanin (The Citizen) 34
Great Patriotic War *see* Second World War
Greenfeld, Liah 2
Grigorev, Apollon Aleksandrovich 32
Gulag Archipelago, The (Solzhenitsyn) 96, 97
Gumilyov, Lev Nikolaevich 135

Habsburg Empire 33, 43
Harriman, Averell 56
Hegel, G.W.F. 50
Helsinki Monitoring Groups 107–8
Herder, Johann G. 10
Herzen, Aleksandr Ivanovich 29, 48–9, 85, 144
historical monuments:
  preservation of 69–70, 71, 78, 118
history:
  Russian nationalism in 77–81
"Holy Alliance" 17, 145
"Holy Russia" 14–15, 16, 142
Hosking, Geoffrey A. 3
human rights movement 94, 103, 107, 108–9
Hungarian revolution 26
Huntington, Samuel P. 33

Iakir, Pyotr 90
Iakovlev, Aleksandr N. 74, 81, 93–4, 113, 117, 118
Iakunin, Father Gleb Pavlovich 66, 107, 126;
  appeal sent to Patriarch Aleksii 65, 84;
  arrest 108;
  attack on subordination of church to state 85;
  critical account of Patriarchate under Stalin 58–9;
  defrocking 133;
  release 119
Ianov, Aleksandr L. 4, 28, 70, 73, 90, 95, 145
Iavlinsky, Grigory Alekseevich 138
ideology:
  and the leadership 112–14
Ignatev, Count Nikolai 33
Ilarion, Metropolitan 111
Ilichev, L.F. 65
IMF (International Monetary Fund) 130, 148

Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR 85
Initiative Group for the Spiritual and Biological Salvation of the People 119
Institute of the World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO) 113
intelligentsia 15, 86;
atheism amongst 35, 46;
Berdiaev's attack on 46, 52;
Solzhenitsyn's attack on 98;
and VSKkSON 82
Iranian Revolution 2
Iraq 131
Isidore, Metropolitan 12
Iskusstvo kino (Cinema Art) 120
Islamic nationalities 68
Israel 69, 92
Iunost'(Youth) 72, 74
Iuvenaly, Metropolitan 104
Ivan III, the Great, Grand Duke and Tsar 12, 14
Ivan IV (Grozny) 14; 15
Ivanov, Aleksandr 1, 7
Ivanov, A.M. 70
Ivanov, Anatoly Mikhailovich *see* Ivanov-Skuratoy, Anatoly
Ivanov, Anatoly S. 73, 120, 122
Ivanov, Iury D. 72
Ivanov, V. 74
Ivanov-Razumnik, R.V. 52
Ivanov-Skuratov, Anatoly 120;
arrest (1959) 64;
arrest and trial (1981) 88, 110–11;
author of "Slovo natsii" 88;
on Slavophils 70;
and Solzhenitsyn 93, 99;
testifying against Osipov 90, 95;
on *Veche* editorial board 90–1, 94
Izvestiia 66

Jacobinism 51, 53, 54
Japan 145–6
Jewish messianism 6, 7–8, 9, 55, 141;
and socialism 51–2
Jews:
and concept of "chosen people" 7, 141;
Dostoevsky and 38–40, 42, 122;
and "Fetisov group" 86;
Gorbachev on 119, 122;
repression of and anti-Semitism 42, 45, 57, 69, 70, 78, 122, 143, 144–5;
and Shimanov 102–3
John Paul II, Pope 139
Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate 59–60, 80, 104, 108
Judentum 39

Kaltakhchian, S. 93
Kapitanchuk, Viktor 107, 108, 109
Kapitonov, I.V. 74
Karam, Elie 59
Karamzin, Nikolai M. 16–17, 19
Karelin, Feliks V. 84, 108
Karpov, Vladimir 118
Kazakhstan 122
Kazakov, Iury 71
KGB 77, 82, 84, 90, 91, 94, 96, 107–8, 110–11, 128
Khaibulin, Hierodeacon Varsonofy 107, 109
Khariuzov, N.A. 59
Khasbulatov, Ruslan Imranovich 132
Kheifets, Mikhail 89–90, 91, 93, 144
Khomeini, Ayatollah Ruhollah 2
Khomiakov, Aleksei Stepanovich 18, 22–3, 25, 27, 30, 46, 91;
and concept of *sobornost'* 22–3;
and Crimean War 28;
death 31;
"Letter to the Serbs" 31;
put under surveillance 26;
"Rossii" 28;
view of Russian Orthodox Church 23;
views on *obshchina* 23, 29, 92
Khovansky, Sergei 116
Khrushchev, Nikita Sergeevich 62;
anti-religious campaign 65, 66;
fall of 67, 69, 84;
speech denouncing Stalin 62, 64
Khrushchev era 62–7
Kiev 11
Kipling, Rudyard 10
Kireevsky, Ivan Vasilevich 21, 23–4, 48, 91, 92;

and Crimean War 28;
death 31;
editing of *Moskvitianin* 26;
philosophy of history 24;
support of censorship 27;
on western culture 24
Kireevsky, Pyotr Vasilevich 18, 31, 92
Kirpichnikov, Anatoly 79
Klimov, Elem 120
Kliuchevsky, Vasily O. 144
Kliuev, Nikolai 52
Kohn, Hans 6
Komi 117
Kommunist 74, 78, 81, 112, 116, 117
Komsomol (Young Communist League) 69, 74;
see also Molodaia gvardiia; Iunost'
Kopelev, Lev Z. 70, 100
korenizatsiia (nativization) 56
Korotich, Vitaly 121, 126
Korsakov, F. 97
Koshelyov, Aleksandr Ivanovich 18, 30, 41, 143
Kosolapov, Richard 132
Kosovo war (1999) 139
Kosygin, Aleksei Nikolaevich 68, 96
Kovalevsky, Pierre 17
Kozhinov, Vadim V. 70, 72, 78, 80, 81, 111–12, 116, 120, 121, 122, 145
Kozyrev, Andrei Vladimirovich 131, 132
Krakhmalnikova, Zoia A. 110
Krivulin, Viktor 106
Kuleshov, Vasily I. 111, 112
Kulikovo Field, battle of 76, 79, 112; 600th anniversary (1980) 74, 78–81
Kuniaev, Stanislav 126
Kuprin, Vladimir 80
Kurbsky, Prince Andrei M. 15, 142
Kuznetsov, Feliks 72, 80, 81
Kuznetsov, Iury 112, 146

Lanshchikov, Anatoly P. 70, 72
Latvia 127
Law on Freedom of Conscience 139
Law on Religious Associations (1929) 58
"Lay of the Host of Igor" 116
Lebed, Aleksandr Ivanovich 134–5, 138
Left Socialist Revolutionaries (SRs) 52, 142
Lenin, Vladimir Ilich 52, 61, 71, 92, 121, 143, 147;
antipathy towards religion 58;
and concept of *sliianie* 56, 65, 113, 124, 144;
embalming of 44;
and federalism 56;
ideology 55–6;
impact of Tkachev and Nechaev on 53;
"Thesis on Peace" 54
Leningrad, Siege of 60
Leningrad seminar 106
Leningrad University 82
Leontev, Konstantin N. 42–3, 47, 71, 83, 135
Lert, Raisa 73, 99
Letter to the Soviet Leaders (Solzhenitsyn) 96, 97, 123
Levitin-Krasnov, Anatoly Emmanuilovich 65, 83, 84, 85, 88, 89, 90, 96, 104
Liberal-Democratic Party of Russia 128, 134
liberalism 46, 102
Lieven, Anatol 3, 140
Ligachev, Egor Kuzmich 116, 122
Likhachev, Dmitry Sergeevich, Academician 77, 78–9, 81, 116, 117, 118
literature 143;
contribution to Russian nationalism 62–4, 75–7;
influence of messianism on leading figures 1
Literaturnaia gazeta 66, 74, 93, 107, 116
Literaturnaia Rossiia 73, 120
Lithuania 14, 126, 127
Liubimov, Iury 114
Lobanov, Mikhail P. 71–2, 73, 111, 122
Loshchits, Iury M. 80, 122
Lotman, Iu.M. 11
"Lovers of Wisdom, The" 19
Lukashenko, Aleksandr 138
Lunacharsky, Anatoly V. 52
Luzhkov, Iury Mikhailovich 139

McDaniel, Tim 133
Maikov, Apollon 34
Manifesto of the Communist Party 49, 50, 51
Marx, Karl 39, 49, 50, 51
Marxism 55;
  messianism and 49–51;
  in Russia 51–2, 61, 141–2
Mashkov, Iury 91
Mashkova, Valentina E. 90, 91
Masons 93, 118, 119
Mazzini, Giuseppe 10
Medvedev, Roy Aleksandrovich 73, 74, 89, 99–100, 126
Medvedev, Zhores Aleksandrovich 110
Meerson-Aksyonov, Mikhail 104
Melentev, Iury 73
Memorial Society 121
Men, Father Aleksandr 84, 127
Meshchersky, Prince V.P. 34
messianism:
  characteristics and definition 1, 6–7;
  Christian 8–9;
  Jewish 6, 7–8, 9, 51–2, 55, 141;
  Marxist 49–51;
  in the West 9–10
"Metanoia" symposium 56–7, 87, 98, 100
Micheletjules 10, 49
Mickiewicz, Adam 10
Mikhailovich, Tsar Aleksei 13
Mikhailovsky, Nikolai K. 85, 143
Mikhalkov, Sergei 66
millenarianism 6–7, 9, 141
Miloševic, Slobodan 139
Ministry of Culture of the RFSR 69, 73
Mirror (film) 80
Mishkinsky, Moshe 51
missionizm 7
Mnogaia leta (Many Years) 108
Mochulsky, Konstantin V. 35
Moldavia 124, 127;
  see also Transdniestria
Molodaia gvardiia (Young Guard) 71–4, 81, 89–90, 123, 146
Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact 60
monasteries 11
Montenegro 33
monuments *see* historical monuments
Moscow 24, 59;
  home of Slavophils 22;
  return of capital to from Petrograd 53
Moscow News 121
Moscow Slav Benevolent Committee 30–1, 32, 34
"Moscow, the Third Rome" 1, 2, 10–12, 19, 44, 55, 59–60, 142;
  Antonov on 92;
  early formulation of 10–11;
  lack of influence on foreign policy 14;
  renouncing of under Peter I 13–14;
  rooted in Muscovite culture 11–12;
  Schismatics belief in 13;
  Shimanov's article on 102;
  Ziuganov on 135–7
Moscow University 19, 22, 64, 111
Moskovskie vedomosti (Moscow Tidings) 24
Moskovskii sbornik (Moscow Compendium) 24, 27, 96
Moskva 66, 73, 78, 123
Moskvich (The Muscovite) 32
Moskvitianin (The Muscovite) 19, 26
Muscovy 11–12, 141, 147;
  church and state in 12–14
Muslims 44, 58, 81, 139

Naidenovich, Adel 90, 94
Napoleon 17
Narodnaia volia (People's Will) 42
narodnichestvo (population) 29, 48, 51, 52, 54, 141
Narodnik messianism 142, 143
narodnost', official 18, 21, 22, 142, 144;
  contributions made by Pushkin and Gogol 21;
  definition 18;
  influences on 19–21;
  nationalist and dynastic wings of 19;
  similarities with Slavophilism 18–19;
  suffering of nationalist wing from attentions of the State 26, 27;
  Ziuganov on 135
Nash sovremennik (Our Contemporary) 64, 72, 111, 116, 121, 122, 123, 146;
  article by Shafarevich 120;

editorial board 76;
hostile to cosmopolitan writers 74;
short essays by Soloukhin 112
National Bolshevism 54, 71, 97
national consciousness *see* nationalism, Russian
National Salvation Front 132, 146
nationalism, Russian 4, 28, 62, 68–81;
and art 76–7;
and battle of Kulikovo Field anniversary 78–81;
dissident *see* dissident Russian nationalism;
growth of amongst intelligentsia 69, 86;
growth of in Brezhnev era and main impulse behind 68–9;
growth of in Khrushchev era 62–7;
growth of non-Russian nationalism gives impetus to 122;
in history 77–81;
history of development 16–17;
and interest in Russian past 69;
lack of ethnic 3;
and literature 62–4, 75–6;
opposition to by Andropov and Chernenko 110–14;
opposition to by Leontev 42–3;
rehabilitation of pre-revolutionary past under Stalin 56–7;
rise of in eighteenth century 2;
and Second World War 56–7
nationalist messianism 3, 7–8, 60, 61, 142
nationality tensions:
growth of 122–6
NATO 136, 137, 139, 147, 148
Nechaev, Sergei G. 35, 51, 53
Nekrasov, Viktor 66
Neue Rheinische Zeitung 50
"new world order" 136
Nicholas I, Tsar 10, 20, 26, 143;
censorship of Slavophils 26, 27;
death 28, 30;
dismissal of Uvarov 144;
ideology 18–19;
sympathy with Slavophilism 91
Nicholas II, Tsar 34, 42, 144
Nikon, Patriarch 2, 13, 16
Nikonov, Anatoly 73
non-Russian nationalities, of USSR 84
Novocherkassk workers' uprising (1962) 83
Novyi mir (New World) 63, 64, 66, 74, 121, 125;
article by Likhachev 78–9;
clash with Stalinists 72–3, 76, 121;
flagship of *pro-perestroika* liberal nationalists 120;
Zalygin as editor 118, 120

obshchina 43, 142;
Antonov on 92;
benefits of 49;
Herzen's view of 48, 49;
Khomiakov's view of 23, 29, 38, 92;
and Marx 51;
view that Russia should develop on the basis of 44, 48
Obshchina (journal) 106, 108
October Revolution 47, 55, 71, 78, 101, 136, 144;
presented as manifestation of Russian spirit 71;
and Russian messianism 2, 52–4, 60, 102
Odoevsky, Prince Vladimir F. 19–20
official *narodnost' see narodnost',* official
Ogonek 72–3, 73, 121
Ogorodnikov, Aleksandr I. 106, 108, 119
Ogurtsov, Igor Viacheslavovich 82, 84, 119
Oktiabr' 64, 72
Old Believers 2, 13, 15, 22, 141, 142, 146
Orthodoxy 101, 107, 108, 109;
Catholicism's superiority to belief 45;
and Dostoevsky 37–8;
and pan-Slavism 33;
and Slavophilism 12, 22–3, 31, 25;
and VSKhSON 83;
see also Russian Orthodox Church
Osipov, Vladimir Nikolaevich 83, 89, 94–5, 109, 119, 132;
arrest of 64, 95;
background 64;

elected leader of Council of the Christian Patriotic Union 119;
and Ivanov-Skuratov 64;
and Solzhenitsyn 93, 99, 100;
split between editors on *Veche* and 90, 94;
and *Veche* 63, 90, 94;
and *Zemlia* 94–5, 119
Otechestvo (Fatherland) Society 123
Ottoman Empire 33, 43
Ovchinnikov, Ivan V. 90, 91, 94

Paleologina, Sophia 12
Palievsky, Pyotr 78
Pamiat' (Memory) 118–19, 121–2
pan-Slavism 25–6, 47;
development of and ideas behind 32–4;
and Dostoevsky *see* Dostoevsky;
and Orthodoxy 33;
shift from religion to race as basis of Slav unity 32–3;
and Slavophilism 25–6, 28, 30–1;
State opposition to 143
parliament crisis (1993) 132, 146
Parvus (A.L.Helfand) 51
Pasternak, Boris 63
Patriarchate 58, 65–6;
see also Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate;
Russian Orthodox Church
patriotism 78–9, 81, 100, 143
Paul, St 102
peasantry:
as best representatives of Russian traditions 76;
and Dostoevsky 32;
ideology based on "Holy Russia" and the "saintly ruler" 14, 15;
and Slavophils 19, 23;
and village prose 62–3;
see also obshchina
people-orientated messianism 3, 142
perestroika 115, 122, 146, 147
Permanent Revolution, theory of 51
Pestel, Pavel 144
Peter, Hugh 10
Peter I, the Great 13–14, 21, 97, 142, 143;
Aksakov on 24;
brings about changes in relations between church and state 13, 85;
denial of Russian messianism 13–14;
reforms 32;
view of by Slavophils 33;
and westernization 1, 2, 13–14, 15, 16, 19, 20
Petersburg 14, 24, 32, 87;
see also Leningrad
Petrashevsky circle 32
philosophy, Russian 46
Pikul, Valentin S. 78
Pimen, Patriarch 80, 103, 105, 125
Pitirim, Metropolitan 80, 116–17, 123
Plekhanov, Georgy V. 51
Pliushch, Leonid Ivanovich 63, 69
Pobedonostsev, Konstantin P. 34, 42
pochvennichestvo 32, 41, 46, 83
Podberezkin, Aleksei 135, 136
Pogodin, Mikhail Petrovich 31, 143, 144;
banning of work by State and censorship of 26, 27;
and Crimean War 28;
influence on Slavophils 19;
"Letter on Russian History" 25;
and *Moskvitianin* 19
Poklonnaia gora memorial complex (Moscow) 137
Poland 2, 10, 25
Poles 1, 16, 21, 146, 147
Poliansky, Dimitri S. 74, 95
Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee 73, 74, 95, 96, 113, 115
Politicheskii dnevnik (Political Diary) 73
Pomerants, Grigory 63, 98, 100, 120
Popov, Gavriil 121
Popular Fronts 122, 124
Populism *see narodnichestvo*
Poresh, Vladimir 108, 119
Pospielovsky, Dimitry V. 4
Prague Spring 71
Pravda 66, 77, 78, 111, 113
Primakov, Evgeny Maksimovich 138
Prizel, Ilya 129
Programme of the Democratic Movement of the Soviet Union 88
Prokhanov, Aleksandr 116, 132, 145

proletariat 51, 55;
as universal class idea 49–50
Proskurin, Pyotr L. 73, 113, 120
Protestantism 23
Pushkin, Aleksandr S. 72, 79, 80;
Dostoevsky's speech on 40–1, 111, 125

Radek, Karl 54
Radugin, K. 87–8
Raeff, Marc 22
Rahv, Philip 36
Rasputin, Valentin Grogorevich 72, 75–6, 81, 117, 120, 122, 132;
article on "Kulikovo Field" 79;
"Farewell to Matyora" 63, 75–6;
and Pamiat' 121–2;
"Pozhar" 116;
speech to CPD (1989) 123–4
Razveev, Boris 106
redemption 7;
through suffering 1, 31, 37, 60, 87, 98–9
Regelson, Lev 107, 108
repentance:
Solzhenitsyn on 97
republics 68, 127–8, 131;
declaration of independence 128;
nationalist tensions 122, 123
resurrection 43, 44, 47, 87, 105
revivalists *see vozrozhdentsy*
Revolution (1905) 42
revolutions (1848) 26, 27, 50
Reznik, Semyon 77–8, 90–1
Rhodes, Cecil 10
Riasanovsky, Nicholas V. 19, 27
Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact 60
"Rodina" (Motherland) clubs 69, 70
Rodionov, Viacheslav S. 90, 94
Rogger, Hans 16
Roman Catholicism *see* Catholicism
Romanov, Michael 13
romanticism, German 19
Rothschild family 38
RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic) 56, 68, 124, 125, 126, 128, 130–1, 146
Rublyov, Andrei 80;
see also Andrei Rublev (film)
Rudiak, Iury 124
Russian Christian Democratic Movement 126, 133
Russian Empire 3
Russian Federation 3, 128, 130, 131, 136, 138, 147
"Russian idea" 133–40, 145
Russian Idea, The (Berdiaev) 55
Russian Marxism 51–2, 61, 141–2
Russian minorities outside the Russian Federation 131, 132, 134, 135
Russian National Unity (RNE) 132
Russian Orthodox Church 2, 21, 37, 103, 141;
alliance with nationalists 138–9;
and anniversary of battle of Kulikovo Field 80;
anti-religious campaign and destruction of churches 65–7;
celebration of millennium 125;
dissent within and Russian messianism 2, 84–8;
and Gorbachev 125;
and Khomiakov 23;
Nikon's changes 13;
privileged position of under Stalin 58–9, 60;
promotion of Soviet foreign policy 60;
relations with state in eighteenth century 12–14;
relaxation in relations with 143;
restoration of Patriarchate in Moscow 53;
revival during Brezhnev era 104;
and Russian messianism under Lenin and Stalin 58–60;
and Second World War 58;
symbol of national unity 11;
thaw in relations with State after fall of Khrushchev 84;
see also Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate
Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic *see* RSFSR
Russkii vestnik (Russian Herald) 119
Russo-Turkish War 34, 35, 45, 92
Rutskoi, Aleksandr Vladimirovich 132

Ruud, Charles 16
Rywkin, Michael 74
Ryzhkov, Nikolai Ivanovich 128

Sado, Mikhail Iukhanovich 82, 84
St Petersburg *see* Petersburg
St Sergei Monastery of the Holy Trinity 13
Sakharov, Andrei Dimitrievich, Academician 77, 95, 96, 99
Samarin, Iury Fyodorovich 18, 19, 25, 27, 30, 32, 143
samobytnost' 20, 22, 88
Sarkisyanz, Emanuel 14
sblizhenie 113
Schelling 19
Schism/Schismatics 13, 15, 20
Schleiermacher, Friedrich 10
Schöpflin, George 3
scientific socialism 61
"Scythians" 52
Second World War 56–7, 58, 60, 142
sectarians 15
Seleznyov, Iury Ivanovich 78, 79–80, 81, 111, 112
Semanov, Sergei N. 72, 73, 74, 77–8, 94, 110, 111
Serbia 1, 2:
  collapse (1877) 34;
  relations with Russia 139;
  war against Turkey 33, 34
Serbs 146:
  Khomiakov's "letter" to 31
Sergii, Metropolitan 58
Service, Robert 134
Sevastopol 132
Sever (The North) 75
Shafarevich, Igor Rostislavovich 96, 97, 99, 120, 126, 132
Shatalin Plan 127
Shauro, V.F. 74
Shelepin, Aleksandr N. 74, 95
Shevyryov, Stepan Petrovich 19, 26
Shimanov, Gennady Mikhailovich 87, 96, 99, 100–4, 108, 137
Shirinsky-Shikhmatov, Prince Plato 27
Shmelyov, Nikolai 121
Siberia:
  plan to reverse Ob and Irtysh rivers in 117
Six-Day War (1967) 69
Skobelev, General Mikhail D. 14, 41, 92, 146
Slavophilism 18–29, 46, 47, 141, 143;
  Aksakov's memorandum to Alexander II 30;
  censorship and repression of by the State 26–7;
  differences within 19, 22;
  discussion on (1969) 70;
  early opposition to strong state 83, 97, 104;
  emphasis on Russian national unity 91, 142;
  golden age of 22;
  and Herzen 48;
  influences on 19–21;
  and Khomiakov's "Letter to the Serbs" 31;
  and Leontev 42–3;
  liberalizing of censorship by Alexander II 20;
  and Orthodoxy 2, 22–3, 25, 31;
  and pan-Slavism 25–6, 28, 30–1;
  and peasantry 19, 23;
  and *pochvennichestvo* 32;
  and rejection of West 2;
  republishing of works by 70, 100–1;
  similarities with official *narodnost'* 18–19;
  and Solovyov 44, 45;
  Solzhenitsyn's approach and 97–8;
  State opposition to 143
Slavs 10, 25, 145;
  see also pan-Slavism
sliianie, 65, 113, 124, 144
"Slovo natsii" 88–9, 93
Sobesednik 119
Sobolev, Leonid S. 64
sobornost' 22, 23, 137
Social Christianity 83, 84
socialism 43, 55;
  Berdiaev's view of 55;
  Dostoevsky's attack on 35;
  and Jewish messianism 40, 51–2;
  opposition to by Fyodorov 43;

opposition to by VSKhSON 83
"Socialism in one country" 54, 60, 142, 143
Sofronov, Anatoly V. 72–3
Soiuz (Union) group 127
Solomentsev, Mikhail S. 74
Soloukhin, Vladimir Alekseevich 63, 70, 71, 73, 91, 94, 112, 121, 144
Solovetsky Islands 79
Solovyov, Vladimir Sergeevich 43, 44–6, 83, 143;
and Catholicism 45, 47;
definition of messianism 7;
publication of writings in (1989) 125;
and reunification of Christianity 44, 45;
"Three Forces" article 44–5
Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr Isaevich 63–4, 71, 96–100, 120;
absence of Russian messianism in work 98;
article attacking intelligentsia 98;
August (1914) 93;
and Chalmaev 73;
critical of Yeltsin's regime 133–4;
criticism of 96;
A Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich 63–4;
expulsion from Soviet Union 95, 96;
fear of growth of nationality tensions 122;
From under the Rubble 87, 96, 99, 144;
on importance of churches as monuments 66;
Letter to the Soviet Leaders 96, 97, 99, 123;
"Matryona's House" 63;
on national minorities 97;
on NATO 139;
and Osipov's arrest and sentence 95;
"Rebuilding Russia" article 127;
on repentance 97;
and Shimanov 101;
on suffering and redemption 98–9;
views of by *Veche* editors 93
Sorokin, Valentin 76
Sovetskaia kul'tura 79
Sovetskaia Rossiia 122, 124, 128, 139
Soviet Union:
collapse of 2, 3, 115, 130, 142, 146;
formation 56;
road to collapse 126–9;
as a superpower 2–3
Spiritual Heritage movement 135, 136
Stalin, Joseph Vissarionovich 61, 144, 145;
death 57;
denouncing of by Khrushchev in speech (1956) 62, 64;
rehabilitation of in *Molodaia gvardiia* 71–2, 73;
and Russian Orthodox Church 58–9;
and Second World War 56–7;
and "Socialism in one Country" 54, 60, 142, 143
Stalingrad, Battle of 60
Stalinism 142;
appraisal of Russian messianism and 60–1
Starozhubaev, I. 92–3
State 15, 142, 143, 144;
early opposition to by Slavophils 83, 97, 104;
relations with Russian Orthodox Church in eighteenth century 12–14
state-orientated messianism 3, 142
Stefan, Metropolitan 59–60
Strakhov, Nikolai Nikolaevich 32, 33, 34, 72
Struve, Nikita A. 100
Stukalin, Boris 113
suffering:
component of Russian messianism 21;
endurance of by Russia 1;
redemption through 1, 31, 37, 60, 87, 98–9, 146–7
Supreme Being idea 112
Supreme Soviet (Russia) 124, 126, 128, 131, 132
Suslov, Mikhail A. 73, 74, 110, 112
Svetlova, Natalia 93
Symbolist poets 46, 52

Tajikistan 131
Talantov, Boris V. 65
Talmon, Yonina 7
Tarkovsky, Andrei 1, 67, 80, 114

Tatars 38, 79, 80, 81, 85, 141
Telegin, Semyon 98
"Thaw":
in Russian culture 62
"theocratic utopia", idea of 44
"Third Rome" theory *see* "Moscow, the Third Rome" *37* 106
Tiazhelnikov, E.M. 113
Tikhon, Patriarch 58
"Time of Troubles" 13
Tiutchev, Fyodor Ivanovich 19, 25–6, 28, 31, 32, 34
Tkachev, Pyotr S. 51, 53
Tolstoi, Lev Nikolaevich 55
Transdniestria 134, 140
Troitsky, Evgeny 133
Trotsky, Lev Davidovich 51, 53, 54
Trotskyism 54
Tsiolkovsky, Konstantin 44
Tucker, Robert C. 15
Tumarkin, Nina 44
Turgenev, Ivan Sergeevich 41
Turkey 33;
war with Russia *see* Russo-Turkish war
Tvardovsky, Aleksandr T. 73, 121

Ukraine 13, 88, 97, 127, 128, 131, 132
Ukrainian Uniate Church 58
Ukrainians 38, 57, 59, 144
Union for the Spiritual Revival of the Fatherland 123
Union Treaty 128
Union of Writers of RSFSR *see* Writers Union of RSFSR
United States 10;
perceived desire for world domination 136, 147
universalism 111;
and Berdiaev 54–5;
and Solovyov 44–5
universalist messianism 3, 24, 57, 60, 93, 142, 143;
and Dostoevsky 40–1;
tensions between nationalist messianism and 7–8;
and VSKhSON 83
unofficial Russian messianism *see* dissident Russian messianism
Uspensky, B.A. 11
USSR *see* Soviet Union
Ustrialov, Nikolai V. 54
utopianism 7, 32
Uvarov, Sergei S. 18, 19, 26, 27, 144
Uzbekistan 122

Vagin, Evgeny Aleksandrovich 82–3, 84
Vasilev, Dmitry 118
Vasilevich, Ivan 18
Vasily II 12
Vasily III 12
Veche 63, 64, 87, 89–96, 97, 108, 121, 143, 146;
article on "Slovo natsii" 88;
ceasing of publication 94;
founding 89;
replacement of Osipov as editor 94;
split in editorial board 90–1, 94;
summary of contents 91–4
Vekhi (Landmarks) 46–7, 52, 98, 120
Vestnik RSKhD (Herald of the Russian Student Christian Movement) 87, 95, 100, 101
Vikulov, Sergei V. 76, 121
village prose 62;
see also derevenshchiki
Vinogradov, Igor 121
Vishnevskaia, Iuliia 88
Vladimov, Georgy 74, 110
Vlasov, A.V. 124
Volkov, Oleg 77, 119
VOOP (All-Russian Society for the Protection of Nature) 70
VOOPIiK (All-Russian Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments) 70, 118
Voprosy literatury 70
Voznesensky, Andrei 74, 117
vozrozhdentsy 71, 77, 81, 116, 118, 120, 142–3, 144
Vremia (Time) 32, 70
VSKhSON (All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Emancipation of the People) 67, 82–4, 86, 89, 108

Vybor (The Choice) 119–20

Walicki, Andrzej 20, 36
Werblowsky, R.J.Zwi 6
West:
attack on culture of 57;
idea of reconciliation between Russia and *(pochvennichestvo)* 32, 41, 46, 83;
messianism in 9–10;
relations with post-Soviet Russia 131, 148;
Russian feelings against during Kosovo war 139;
Slavophils' views of 23
westernization 101;
national consciousness as product of 16;
opposition to by Old Believers 22;
and Peter the Great 1, 2, 13–14, 15, 16, 19, 20
Writers Union Congress 117
Writers Union of RSFSR 64, 73, 77

Yakobson, S.O. 16
Yanov *see* Ianov
Yeltsin, Boris *see* Eltsin, Boris Nikolaevich
Yugoslavia, former 139

Zakrevsky, Count A.A. 27
Zalygin, Sergei Pavlovich 63, 96, 118, 120
Zaria (Dawn) 33
Zasulich, Vera 51
Zemlia (The Land) 94–5, 119
Zenkovsky, V.V. 22
Zhdanov, A.A. 57
Zhirinovsky, Vladimir Volfovich 128, 134, 135, 146
Zhukov, Dmitry 77
Zhurnal Moskovskoi patriarkhii see Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate
Zhurnalist 72
Zionism 118, 119
Ziuganov, Gennady Andreevich 128, 132, 135–7, 138, 139, 140, 146
Zolutussky, Igor 71
Zosima, Father 37, 94, 100